arXiv:1301.1811v2 [math.AP] 27 Feb 2013

Asymptotic symmetry for a class of nonlinear fractional reaction-diffusion equations

Sven Jarohs[*] and Tobias Weth[†]

February 28, 2013

Abstract

We study the nonlinear fractional reaction-diffusion equation $\partial_t u + (-\Delta)^s u = f(t,x,u)$, $s \in (0,1)$ in a bounded domain Ω together with Dirichlet boundary conditions on $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$. We prove asymptotic symmetry of nonnegative globally bounded solutions in the case where the underlying data obeys some symmetry and monotonicity assumptions. More precisely, we assume that Ω is symmetric with respect to reflection at a hyperplane, say $\{x_1 = 0\}$, and convex in the x_1-direction, and that the nonlinearity f is even in x_1 and nonincreasing in $|x_1|$. Under rather weak additional technical assumptions, we then show that any nonzero element in the ω-limit set of nonnegative globally bounded solution is even in x_1 and strictly decreasing in $|x_1|$. This result, which is obtained via a series of new estimates for antisymmetric supersolutions of a corresponding family of linear equations, implies a strong maximum type principle which is not available in the non-fractional case $s = 1$.

Keywords. Fractional Laplacian · Asymptotic Symmetry · Moving Hyperplanes · Harnack Inequality

Mathematics Subject Classification: 35K58 · 35B40

1 Introduction

We consider the nonlinear fractional diffusion problem

$$(P) \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t u + (-\Delta)^s u = f(t,x,u) & \text{in } (0,\infty)\times\Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } (0,\infty)\times(\mathbb{R}^N\setminus\Omega), \end{cases}$$

where Ω is a bounded Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 3$, $s \in (0,1)$ and f is a nonlinearity defined on $(0,\infty)\times\Omega\times\mathscr{B}$. Here and in the following, $\mathscr{B} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an open interval (further assumptions

---

[*] Institut für Mathematik, Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt, Robert-Mayer-Straße 10, D-60054 Frankfurt, jarohs@math.uni-frankfurt.de.

[†] Institut für Mathematik, Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt, Robert-Mayer-Straße 10, D-60054 Frankfurt, weth@math.uni-frankfurt.de.

on f are to be specified later). Moreover, $(-\Delta)^s$ denotes the fractional Laplacian, which for functions $u \in H^{2s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is defined via Fourier transform:

$$\widehat{(-\Delta)^s u}(\xi) = |\xi|^{2s}\widehat{u}(\xi) \qquad \text{for a.e. } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{1.1}$$

Fueled by various applications in physics, biology or finance, linear and nonlinear equations of the form given in (P) or of similar type have received immensely growing attention recently. In particular, evolution equations involving the fractional Laplacian appear in the quasi-geostrophic equations (see e.g. [11,32]) and in the fractional porous medium equation (see [29]), while further applications in the context of stable processes are considered e.g. in [2, 21]. Very recently, the fractional Laplacian has been studied in conformal geometry, see [14, 22]. In order to incorporate the Dirichlet boundary condition on $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$ in (P), the operator $(-\Delta)^s$ has to be replaced by the Friedrichs extension of the restriction of $(-\Delta)^s$ to the space $C_c^\infty(\Omega) \subset L^2(\Omega)$ of test functions. Here and in the following, we identify $L^2(\Omega)$ with the space $\{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N) : u \equiv 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega\}$. This new operator, which we will also denote by $(-\Delta)^s$ in the following, has the form domain $\mathscr{H}_0^s(\Omega) = \{u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N) : u \equiv 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega\}$, and it is widely used in analysis and probability theory. In particular, it has recently been considered in the context of semilinear problems, see e.g. [3, 5, 24] and the references therein. In probabilistic terms, the operator coincides with the generator of the $2s$-stable process in Ω killed upon leaving Ω. We note that for $u \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ we have the representation

$$(-\Delta)^s u(x) = c_{N,s} P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(x)-u(y)}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} dy = c_{N,s} P.V. \int_{\Omega} \frac{u(x)-u(y)}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} dy + u(x)\kappa_\Omega(x) \tag{1.2}$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, where $P.V.$ stands for the principal value integral and

$$c_{N,s} = s(1-s)\pi^{-N/2}4^s \frac{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2}+s)}{\Gamma(2-s)}, \qquad \kappa_\Omega(x) := c_{N,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega} |x-y|^{-N-2s} dy \text{ for } x \in \Omega \tag{1.3}$$

(see e.g. [8, Remark 3.11]). The first summand in (1.2) describes the jump behavior of the $2s$-stable process inside Ω, whereas the function κ_Ω is called the *killing measure* of the process.

The focus of the present paper is the asymptotic shape of global bounded solutions of (P), i.e., the symmetry (and monotonicity) of elements in the corresponding ω-limit sets. For this we will use a weak formulation for solutions of (P). The quadratic form corresponding to $(-\Delta)^s$ on $\mathscr{H}_0^s(\Omega)$ is given by

$$\mathscr{E}(u,v) = \langle (-\Delta)^{s/2}u, (-\Delta)^{s/2}v \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)} = \frac{c_{N,s}}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(u(x)-u(y))(v(x)-v(y))}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}\, dx\, dy. \tag{1.4}$$

Since Ω is bounded, $\mathscr{E}$ defines a scalar product on $\mathscr{H}_0^s(\Omega)$ which is equivalent to the standard scalar product induced from the embedding $\mathscr{H}_0^s(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Consider the space $C_0(\Omega) := \{u \in C(\mathbb{R}^N) : u \equiv 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega\}$ endowed with the usual L^∞-norm. We say that a function $u : (0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ is a solution of (P) if $u \in C((0,\infty), \mathscr{H}_0^s(\Omega) \cap C_0(\Omega)) \cap C^1((0,\infty), L^2(\Omega))$, $u(t,x) \in \mathscr{B}$ for every $(t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times \Omega$ and

$$\mathscr{E}(u(t),\varphi) = \int_\Omega (f(t,x,u) - \partial_t u)\varphi\, dx \qquad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathscr{H}_0^s(\Omega),\, t \in (0,\infty). \tag{1.5}$$

For a solution u of (P), we define the ω-limit set (with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty}$) as

$$\omega(u) := \{z \in C_0(\Omega) : \|u(t_k) - z\|_{L^\infty} \to 0 \text{ for some } t_k \to \infty\}$$

To state our main result, we introduce the following assumptions.

(D1) Ω is bounded with a Lipschitz boundary. Moreover, Ω is convex and symmetric in x_1, i.e., for every $x \in \Omega$ and $s \in [-1,1]$ we have $(sx_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \in \Omega$.

(D2) For every $\lambda > 0$, the set $\Omega_\lambda := \{x \in \Omega : x_1 > \lambda\}$ has at most finitely many connected components.

(F1) $f : (0,\infty) \times \Omega \times \mathscr{B} \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous. Moreover, for every bounded subset $K \subset \mathscr{B}$ there exists $L = L(K) > 0$ such that $\sup\limits_{x\in\Omega, t>0} |f(t,x,u) - f(t,x,v)| \le L|u-v|$ for $u, v \in K$.

(F2) f is symmetric in x_1 and nonincreasing in $|x_1|$, i.e., for every $t \in (0,\infty)$, $u \in \mathscr{B}$, $x \in \Omega$ and $s \in [-1,1]$ we have $f(t, sx_1, x_2, \dots, x_N, u) \ge f(t,x,u)$.

We note that $(D2)$ is a technical assumption which is needed for some but not all of our results. The main result of this paper is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (D1), (F1), (F2) be satisfied, and let u be a nonnegative global solution of* (P) *satisfying the following conditions:*

(U1) There is $c_u \in \mathbb{R}^+$ *such that* $\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty} \le c_u$ *for every* $t > 0$.

(U2) The functions $u(\tau + \cdot, \cdot)$, $\tau \ge 1$ *are equicontinuous on* $[0,1] \times \Omega$, *that is*

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \sup_{\substack{\tau \ge 1 \\ x,\tilde{x} \in \overline{\Omega}, t,\tilde{t} \in [\tau,\tau+1], \\ |x-\tilde{x}|, |t-\tilde{t}| < h}} |u(t,x) - u(\tilde{t},\tilde{x})| = 0.$$

Suppose in addition that $(D2)$ *holds* *or* *that* $z \not\equiv 0$ *for every* $z \in \omega(u)$.
Then u is asymptotically symmetric in x_1, *i.e., for all* $z \in \omega(u)$ *we have* $z(-x_1, x') = z(x_1, x')$ *for all* $(x_1, x') \in \Omega$.
Moreover, for every $z \in \omega(u)$ *we have the following alternative: Either* $z \equiv 0$ *on* Ω, *or z is strictly decreasing in* $|x_1|$ *and therefore strictly positive in* Ω.

We immediately deduce the following corollary for equilibria and time-periodic solutions.

Corollary 1.2. *Let (D1) be satisfied for* Ω.

(i) Let $f : \overline{\Omega} \times \mathscr{B} \to \mathbb{R}$, $(x,u) \mapsto f(x,u)$ *be such that*

  (i.1) f *is continuous in* $x \in \overline{\Omega}$ *and locally Lipschitz in u uniformly with respect to x;*

  (i.2) f *is symmetric in* x_1 *and nonincreasing in* $|x_1|$, *i.e., for every* $u \in \mathscr{B}$, $x \in \Omega$ *and* $s \in [-1,1]$ *we have* $f(sx_1, x_2, \dots, x_N, u) \ge f(x,u)$.

Moreover, let $u \in C_0(\Omega) \cap \mathscr{H}_0^s(\Omega)$ *be a nonnegative nontrivial weak solution of the elliptic problem*

$$(-\Delta)^s u = f(x,u) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \qquad u = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \tag{1.6}$$

i.e., we have $u(x) \in \mathscr{B}$ *for a.e.* $x \in \Omega$ *and* $\mathscr{E}(u,\varphi) = \int_\Omega f(x,u(x))\varphi(x)\,dx$ *for every* $\varphi \in \mathscr{H}_0^s(\Omega)$*. Then* u *is symmetric in* x_1*, and* u *is strictly decreasing in* $|x_1|$ *if* $u \not\equiv 0$*.*

(ii) Suppose that $f : (0,\infty) \times \Omega \times \mathscr{B} \to \mathbb{R}$ *satisfies (F1), (F2) and is periodic in* t*, i.e. there is* $T > 0$ *such that* $f(t+T,x,u) = f(t,x,u)$ *for all* t,x,u*. Suppose furthermore that* u *is a nontrivial nonnegative* T*-periodic solution of* (P)*, i.e.,* $u(t+T,x) = u(t,x)$ *for all* $x \in \Omega, t \in (0,\infty)$*. Suppose finally that either* $(D2)$ *holds or that* $u(t,\cdot) \not\equiv 0$ *on* Ω *for all* t*. Then* $u(t,\cdot)$ *is symmetric in* x_1 *and strictly decreasing in* $|x_1|$ *for all times* $t \in (0,\infty)$*.*

Remark 1.3. (i) The nonnegativity assumption on u in Theorem 1.1 can be weakened in special cases. More precisely, if the other assumptions of Theorem 1.1 are satisfied, $u(t_0,\cdot)$ is nonnegative on Ω for some $t_0 > 0$ and $f(t,\cdot,0) \geq 0$ for all $t \geq t_0$, then $u(t,\cdot)$ is nonnegative for $t \geq t_0$ as a consequence of the weak maximum principle in the form discussed in Remark 2.6 below. Thus Theorem 1.1 applies to u after a time shift.
(ii) Assumption $(U2)$ implies that $\{u(t,\cdot) : t > 0\} \subset C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ is relatively compact and therefore $\omega(u)$ is nonempty. In Proposition 4.1 below we give sufficient conditions for $(U2)$ to hold.
(iii) In the case where, in addition to the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a ball centered at zero and f is radially symmetric, i.e. $f(t,x,u) = \tilde{f}(t,|x|,u)$, it follows – by the invariance of the equation under rotations – from Theorem 1.1 that every $z \in \omega(u)$ is radially symmetric as well. In the special case of equilibria, i.e., solutions of (1.6), this has been proved in [3] under more restrictive assumptions on the nonlinearity.
(iv) We point out that we do not require an a priori positivity assumption on elements in $\omega(u)$ in Theorem 1.1, and thus we also do not need to assume strict positivity of solutions of (1.6) in Corollary 1.2. This is a special feature of the nonlocal problems (P) and (1.6). The strong maximum principle given by Theorem 1.1 for elements $z \in \omega(u)$ and by Corollary 1.2 for nonnegative solutions of (1.6) is a consequence of the *monotonicity* of the nonlinearity, and it is derived as a byproduct of the method proving the symmetry results (see in particular Lemma 3.2 below). This contrasts with the local case $s = 1$, where counterexamples show that such a strong maximum principle is false, see [28, Theorem 1.1], [26, Section 5] and the references therein. In this case, an additional positivity assumption as e.g. in [26, Theorem 2.2] is necessary to obtain asymptotic symmetry.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is based on a parabolic variant of the moving plane method. As far as the main structure of the argument is concerned, we follow the strategy elaborated by Poláčik [26, 27] in the context of Dirichlet problems for fully nonlinear parabolic differential equations, but we need new and quite different tools. We recall that the moving plane method has its roots in a classical work of Alexandrov [1] on constant mean curvature surfaces and Serrin [31] on overdetermined boundary value problems, whereas Gidas, Ni and Nirenberg [20] provided the framework to consider Dirichlet problems for nonlinear elliptic differential equations. In the case where the underlying domain is $\mathbb{R}^N$, the method of moving plane has been applied in integral form in [16,18] to deduce symmetry and classification results for solutions of semilinear elliptic equations involving the fractional Laplacian. Birkner, Lopéz-Mimbela and Wakolbinger [3] used a variant of the moving plane method, paired with probabilistic methods, to prove radial symmetry of all equilibria of (P) in the case where the underlying domain is the unit ball B and the nonlinearity f is nonnegative, independent of t and x, and nondecreasing in u. Up to the authors' knowledge, our results are the first symmetry results for parabolic boundary value problems involving the fractional Laplacian and even for the elliptic problem if f depends on x or the domain is more general than a ball. We point out that – in comparison with the elliptic case – proving asymptotic symmetry in the parabolic setting with the moving plane approach requires much finer – time dependent – estimates. This is already evident from the seminal work of Poláčik [26, 27] for the case of nonlinear differential equations. One key requirement is a special version of a parabolic Harnack inequality related to a linear fractional diffusion equation. Felsinger and Kassmann derived a parabolic Harnack inequality in [19], which requires nonnegativity of the solutions in the entire space. This global nonnegativity assumption is not technical since – already in the elliptic case – the Harnack inequality for the fractional Laplacian is not valid in a purely local form, see e.g. [23, Theorem 2.2] for a counterexample. However, since the moving plane method consists in studying the difference between the reflection of a solution of (P) at a hyperplane and the solution itself, we need to derive a corresponding Harnack inequality for antisymmetric (and therefore sign changing) supersolutions of a class of linear problems in the present paper. Another (closely related) problem in the fractional setting is the lack of local comparison principle to derive estimates via sub- or supersolutions. Here much finer quantitative arguments are needed to control the nonlocal effects and exclude the appearance of intersections in finite time. We will establish such estimates in two steps in Section 2.3 below, passing first to the Caffarelli-Silvestre extension of the solution u, which is defined, for each fixed time, on the half space $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+$ (see [9]).

It seems worthwhile to note that another type of Dirichlet boundary conditions has also been assigned to the fractional Laplacian in the literature. In [10, 12, 34]), the authors consider the s-th power of the Dirichlet Laplacian in spectral theoretic sense, which – in the case of a bounded domain Ω – is given by $A^s_\Omega u := \sum\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_k^s u_k e_k$. Here $\mu_k = \mu_k(\Omega)$ are the eigenvalues of the Dirichlet Laplacian on Ω in increasing order (counted with multiplicity), e_k, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ are the corresponding eigenfunctions and $u_k := \int_\Omega u e_k \, dx$ the corresponding Fourier coefficients of u.

In order to explain the role of A^s_Ω in terms of stochastic processes, we recall that the $2s$-stable process is constructed by subordinating Brownian motion with a s-stable subordinator, see [2, Chapter 1.3]. On the other hand, the process generated by A^s_Ω is obtained by first killing Brownian motion upon leaving Ω and then subordinating this process with a s-stable subordinator, see e.g. [33]. Hence the order of killing and subordination is reversed in this case. It is easy to see that the corresponding operators coincide only if $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ (where the Dirichlet boundary conditions are not present). For more information related to these stochastic processes and their generators, we refer the reader to [4], [21] or [2, Chapter 3]. It is natural to ask whether a result similar to Theorem 1.1 is true for the corresponding problem with the operator A^s_Ω. This is part of work in progress by the authors. For elliptic semilinear problems involving the operator A^s_Ω, symmetry and monotonicity results have been proved recently in special cases in [10, 12] by applying the moving plane method to the the Caffarelli-Silvestre extensions of the solutions.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we develop the new tools we need to carry out the moving plane method for the fractional parabolic problem (P). We believe that the results of this Section could be of interest for other problems as well. Since, as already noted, the moving plane method consists in studying the difference between the reflection of a solution of (P) at a hyperplane and the solution itself, we are led to study antisymmetric supersolutions of linear problems here. Due to the nonlocality of the fractional Laplacian, it is important to estimate the influence of the negative part of these functions. This is one of the key differences in comparison with local problems involving classical differential operators. The first part of this Section is concerned with a parabolic small volume maximum principle. In Section 2.2 we establish a parabolic Harnack inequality for antisymmetric supersolutions of a class of linear fractional problems. To overcome the problem that we are dealing with sign changing antisymmetric supersolutions, we reformulate the problem and use a Harnack inequality derived recently in [19]. Section 2.3 is devoted to a generalized subsolution estimate. The idea to control the positive part of the solution by comparing with suitable subsolutions is inspired by [26]. However, as mentioned above, the argument is essentially more involved in the present setting, and this is the only stage where we had to pass to the Caffarelli-Silvestre extension to obtain the required estimate. In Section 2.4, we combine all estimates obtained so far to deduce our main result on antisymmetric supersolutions for a class of linear problems which should be seen as an analogue of [26, Theorem 3.7] for the fractional case. The moving plane argument is then carried out in Section 3. Here we follow the main structure of the argument in [26, Chapter 4], but we need to implement some new ideas at key points (see in particular the proof of Lemma 3.2) in the nonlocal setting. In the appendix, we present a sufficient condition for $(U2)$, and we discuss a specific example to which Theorem 1.1 applies.

1.1 Notation

The following notation is used throughout the paper. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $r > 0$, $B_r(x)$ is the open ball centered at x with radius r and ω_N will denote the volume of the N-dimensional ball with radius 1 For any subset $M \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, we denote by $1_M : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ the characteristic function of M and $\operatorname{diam}(M)$ the diameter of M. Moreover, we let $\operatorname{inrad}(M)$ denote the supremum of all $r > 0$ such that *every* connected component of M contains a ball $B_r(x_0)$ with $x_0 \in M$. This notation – taken from [26] – differs slightly from the usual one but is very convenient in our setting. If $T \subset \mathbb{R}$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ are subsets and $u : T \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, $(t,x) \mapsto u(t,x)$ is a function, we frequently write $u(t)$ in place of $u(t,\cdot) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ for $t \in T$. If $M \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ resp. $M \subset \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ is a subset and $w : M \to \mathbb{R}$ is a function, the inequalities $w \geq 0$ and $w > 0$ are always understood in pointwise sense. Moreover, $w^+ = \max\{w, 0\}$ resp. $w^- = -\min\{w, 0\}$ denote the positive and negative part of w, respectively. If M is measurable with $|M| > 0$ (where $|\cdot|$ always stands for Lebesgue measure) and $w \in L^1(M)$, we put

$$[w]_{L^1(M)} := \frac{1}{|M|} \int\limits_M w(x)\, dx, \qquad [w]_{L^1(M)} := \frac{1}{|M|} \int\limits_M w(t,x)\, dt dx, \qquad \text{respectively},$$

to denote the mean of w over M. If $D, U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ are subsets, the notation $D \subset\subset U$ means that $\overline{D}$ is compact and contained in the interior of U. Moreover, we set

$$\operatorname{dist}(D,U) := \inf(|x-y| \, : \, x \in D, y \in U\},$$

so this notation does *not* stand for the usual Hausdorff distance. If $D = \{x\}$ is a singleton, we simply write $\mathrm{dist}(x,U)$ in place of $\mathrm{dist}(\{x\},U)$. Finally, when we call an interval $T \subset \mathbb{R}$ a time interval, we assume that it consists of more than one point.

Acknowledgement: The authors would like to thank Mouhamed Moustapha Fall and Peter Poláčik for helpful discussions.

2 Antisymmetric supersolutions of a corresponding linear problem

Throughout this section, we consider a fixed open half space H and the reflection $Q : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^N$ at ∂H. We will call a function $w : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ antisymmetric if $w(Q(x)) = -w(x)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, i.e., w is antisymmetric with respect to Q. We first fix notions of supersolutions. For this we introduce the function space

$$\mathscr{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^N) := \{u : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R} \;\; u \text{ measurable}, \; \mathscr{E}(u,u) < \infty\}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\mathscr{E}$ is defined in (1.4). Note that $\mathscr{E}$ defines a semidefinite scalar product on $\mathscr{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ which induces a seminorm and therefore a topology on $\mathscr{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Note that $\mathscr{E}(d,d) = 0$ for any constant function $d \in \mathscr{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Definition 2.1. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be an open subset with $|U| < \infty$, T a time interval and $c, g \in L^\infty(T \times U)$. We call a function $v : T \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ a *supersolution* of

$$\partial_t v + (-\Delta)^s v = c(t,x)v + g(t,x) \tag{2.2}$$

on $T \times U$ if $v \in C(T, \mathscr{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)) \cap C^1(T, L^2(\Omega))$ and

$$\mathscr{E}(v(t),\varphi) \geq \int_U (c(t,x)v(t) + g(t,x) - \partial_t v(t))\varphi \, dx \qquad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathscr{H}_0^s(U),\ \varphi \geq 0 \text{ and } t \in T.$$

If, in addition, $U \subset H$ and v is antisymmetric, we call v an *antisymmetric supersolution*.
A supersolution of (2.2) on $T \times U$ will be called an *entire supersolution* if $v \geq 0$ on $T \times (\mathbb{R}^N \setminus U)$.
If $U \subset H$, an antisymmetric supersolution of (2.2) on $T \times U$ will be called an *entire antisymmetric supersolution* if $v \geq 0$ on $T \times (H \setminus U)$.

Remark 2.2. (i) Note that an entire antisymmetric supersolution v of (2.2) on $T \times U$ may take negative values in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus H$, so in general it is *not* an entire supersolution of (2.2).
(ii) Let T, U and c be as in the definition above. We will mostly consider the case $g \equiv 0$ in the remainder of the paper, i.e., we consider supersolutions of

$$\partial_t v + (-\Delta)^s v = c(t,x)v \tag{2.3}$$

on $T \times U$. We briefly explain the connection between (P) and (2.3). Suppose that $(F1)$ is satisfied and that

$$H \cap \Omega \neq \varnothing, \qquad Q(H \cap \Omega) \subset \Omega \qquad \text{and} \tag{2.4}$$

$$f(t,Q(x),u) \geq f(t,x,u) \qquad \text{for every } t \in (0,\infty), x \in U \text{ and } u \in \mathscr{B}. \tag{2.5}$$

Let u be a nonnegative solution of (P), and let $v(t,x) = u(t,Q(x)) - u(t,x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $t \geq 0$. Then v is an entire antisymmetric supersolution of (2.3) with $T = (0,\infty)$, $U = H \cap \Omega$ and

$$c(t,x) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{f(t,x,u(t,Q(x)) - f(t,x,u(t,x))}{v(x)}, & u(t,Q(x)) \neq u(t,x); \\ 0, & u(t,Q(x)) = u(t,x). \end{cases}$$

Indeed, by (2.4) we have $v \geq 0$ on $T \times (H \setminus U)$. Moreover, for $\varphi \in \mathscr{H}_0^s(U)$, $\varphi \geq 0$ and $t \in (0,\infty)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{E}(v(t),\varphi) &= \mathscr{E}(u(t)\circ Q - u(t),\varphi) = \mathscr{E}(u(t),\varphi\circ Q - \varphi) = \int_\Omega (f(t,x,u) - \partial_t u)[\varphi\circ Q - \varphi]\,dx \\ &= \int_U [f(t,Q(x),u(t,Q(x))) - f(t,x,u(t,x)) - \partial_t(u\circ Q - u)]\varphi\,dx \geq \int_U [c(t,x)v - \partial_t v]\varphi\,dx, \end{aligned}$$

where (2.5) was used in the last step.

The following observation will be useful in the sequel.

Lemma 2.3. *For any $\varphi \in \mathscr{H}_0^s(H)$ and every antisymmetric $v \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ we have*

$$\mathscr{E}(v,\varphi) = \frac{1}{2}\int_H\int_H (v(x)-v(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))J(x,y)dx\,dy + 2\int_H \kappa_H(x)v(x)\varphi(x)\,dx \tag{2.6}$$

with

$$J(x,y) = \frac{c_{N,s}}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} - \frac{c_{N,s}}{|x-Q(y)|^{N+2s}} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_H(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N\setminus H} \frac{c_{N,s}}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}\,dy = \frac{4^s\Gamma(\frac{1}{2}+s)}{\sqrt{\pi}\,\Gamma(1-s)}[\operatorname{dist}(x,\partial H)]^{-2s}$$

for $x,y \in H$, where $c_{N,s}$ is given in (1.3). Moreover

$$J(x,y) \geq \frac{c_{N,s}[1-5^{-N/2-s}]}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} \qquad \text{for } x,y \in H \text{ with } |x-y| \leq \min\{\operatorname{dist}(x,\partial H),\operatorname{dist}(y,\partial H)\}. \tag{2.7}$$

Proof. It is convenient to write $\bar{x}$ in place of $Q(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ in the following. For $\varphi \in \mathscr{H}_0^s(H)$ and an antisymmetric $v \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{E}(v,\varphi) &= \frac{c_{N,s}}{2}\left(\int_H\int_H \frac{(v(x)-v(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}\,dx\,dy + \int_H\int_{\mathbb{R}^N\setminus H} \ldots dx\,dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N\setminus H}\int_H \ldots dx\,dy\right) \\ &= \frac{c_{N,s}}{2}\int_H\int_H \Big[\frac{(v(x)-v(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} - \frac{(v(\bar{x})-v(y))\varphi(y)}{|\bar{x}-y|^{N+2s}} + \frac{(v(x)-v(\bar{y}))\varphi(x)}{|x-\bar{y}|^{N+2s}}\Big]\,dx\,dy \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{c_{N,s}}{2} \int\limits_H \int\limits_H \frac{(v(x)-v(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}\, dx\, dy + c_{N,s} \int\limits_H \int\limits_H \frac{(v(x)+v(y))\varphi(y)}{|x-\overline{y}|^{N+2s}}\, dx\, dy \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int\limits_H \int\limits_H (v(x)-v(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))J(x,y)\, dx\, dy + 2c_{N,s} \int\limits_H \int\limits_H \frac{v(y)\varphi(y)}{|x-\overline{y}|^{N+2s}}\, dx\, dy \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int\limits_H \int\limits_H (v(x)-v(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))J(x,y) dx\, dy + 2 \int\limits_H \kappa_H(x) v(x)\varphi(x)\, dx
\end{aligned}
$$

with J and κ_H as defined above, as claimed. To see (2.7), let $d > 0$ and $x,y \in H$ with $|x-y| \leq d \leq \min\{\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial H), \mathrm{dist}(y,\partial H)\}$. Then $|x-\overline{y}|^2 \geq |x-y|^2 + 4d^2$ and therefore

$$
\frac{|x-y|^2}{|x-\overline{y}|^2} \leq \frac{|x-y|^2}{|x-y|^2+4d^2} \leq \frac{1}{5},
$$

which implies that

$$
\frac{J(x,y)|x-y|^{N+2s}}{c_{N,s}} = \left(1 - \left(\frac{|x-y|^2}{|x-\overline{y}|^2}\right)^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}\right) \geq 1 - 5^{-N/2-s}
$$

as claimed in (2.7). ☐

2.1 A small volume maximum principle

The main result of this subsection is the following.

Proposition 2.4. *For every $c_\infty, \gamma > 0$ there exists $\delta = \delta(N,s,c_\infty,\gamma) > 0$ such that for any open subset $U \subset H$ with $|U| \leq \delta$, any time interval $T := [t_0,t_1]$, any $c \in L^\infty(T \times U)$ with $\|c^+\|_{L^\infty} \leq c_\infty$ and any entire antisymmetric supersolution v of (2.3) on $T \times U$ we have*

$$
\|v^-(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(H)} \leq e^{-\gamma(t-t_0)} \|v^-(t_0,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(H)} \qquad \textit{for all } t \in T. \tag{2.8}
$$

In the proof we will use the following standard estimate, see e.g. [17, Lemma 6.1].

Lemma 2.5. *For every measurable $A \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ we have*

$$
\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus A} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}\, dy \geq K|A|^{-\frac{2s}{N}}
$$

with $K = K(N,s) = \frac{N}{2s}\omega_N^{1+2s/N}$.

Proof of Proposition 2.4. For given $c_\infty, \gamma > 0$ we put $\delta := \left(\frac{c_{N,s}K}{\gamma + c_\infty}\right)^{\frac{N}{2s}}$, where K is given in Lemma 2.5. By assumption and Lemma 2.5, we then have

$$
\kappa_U(x) := \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus U} \frac{c_{N,s}}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}\, dy \geq \gamma + c_\infty \qquad \text{for every } x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{2.9}
$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $t_0 = 0$. Let $d := \|v^-(0)\|_{L^\infty(U)}$, and define $u(t,x) := e^{\gamma t}v(t,x)$ for $t \in [0,t_1]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Then u is an antisymmetric supersolution of $u_t + (-\Delta)^s u = \tilde{c}(t,x)u$ on U with $\tilde{c}(t,x) = c(t,x) + \gamma$. We need to show that

$$u(t,x) \geq -d \qquad \text{for } x \in H \text{ and } t \in [0,t_1]. \tag{2.10}$$

For $0 \leq t \leq t_1$, we consider the function $\varphi(t,\cdot) \in \mathscr{H}_0^s(U)$ defined by $\varphi(t,x) = (u(t,x)+d)^- 1_H(x)$, where 1_H denotes the characteristic function of the half space H. We then have

$$\mathscr{E}(u(t),\varphi(t)) \geq \int\limits_U (\tilde{c}(t,x)u - \partial_t u)\varphi\, dx \geq \int\limits_U (c_\infty + \gamma)u(t)\varphi(t)\, dx + \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int\limits_U \varphi(t)^2\, dx. \tag{2.11}$$

We first claim that

$$\mathscr{E}(u(t),\varphi(t)) \leq -\mathscr{E}(u^-(t)1_H,\varphi(t)) \qquad \text{for } (t,x) \in [0,t_1]. \tag{2.12}$$

Indeed, for $(t,x) \in [0,t_1] \times \mathbb{R}^N$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&(u(t,x)-u(t,y))\,(\varphi(t,x)-\varphi(t,y)) + \big(u^-(t,x)1_H(x) - u^-(t,y)1_H(y)\big)\,(\varphi(t,x)-\varphi(t,y))\\ &\qquad = -\Big[\varphi(t,x)\,\big(u(t,y)+u^-(t,y)1_H(y)\big) + \varphi(t,y)\,\big(u(t,x)+u^-(t,x)1_H(x)\big)\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Thus we find, using the symmetry of the kernel and the antisymmetry of u,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathscr{E}(u(t),\varphi(t)) + \mathscr{E}(u^-(t)1_H,\varphi(t)) = -c_{N,s}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N}\varphi(t,y)\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N}\frac{(u(t,x)+1_H(x)u^-(t,x))}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}\,dxdy\\ &= -c_{N,s}\int\limits_H \varphi(t,y)\int\limits_H\Big(\frac{u^+(t,x)}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} - \frac{u(t,x)}{|Q(x)-y|^{N+2s}}\Big)dxdy\end{aligned}$$

and hence $\mathscr{E}(u(t),\varphi(t)) + \mathscr{E}(u^-(t)1_H,\varphi(t)) \leq 0$ for $t \in [0,t_1]$, since $|x-y| \leq |Q(x)-y|$ for $x,y \in H$ and φ is nonnegative. This shows (2.12). We now put

$$A_1(t) := \{x \in H \,:\, u(t,x) \leq -d\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad A_2(t) := (\mathbb{R}^N \setminus H) \cup \{y \in H \,:\, u(t,y) > -d\}$$

for $t \in [0,t_1]$. Then we have, for $t \in [0,t_1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{E}(u^-(t)1_H,\varphi(t)) &= \frac{c_{N,s}}{2}\int\limits_{A_1(t)}\int\limits_{A_1(t)}\frac{(u^-(t,x)1_H(x)-u^-(t,y)1_H(y))\,(\varphi(t,x)-\varphi(t,y))}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}\,dxdy\\ &\quad + c_{N,s}\int\limits_{A_1(t)}\varphi(t,x)\int\limits_{A_2(t)}\frac{u^-(t,x)1_H(x)-u^-(t,y)1_H(y)}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}\,dydx\\ &\geq \frac{c_{N,s}}{2}\int\limits_{A_1(t)}\int\limits_{A_1(t)}\frac{(\varphi(t,x)-\varphi(t,y))^2}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}dxdy + c_{N,s}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N}\varphi(t,x)\int\limits_{A_2(t)}\frac{d-u^-(t,y)1_H(y)}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}\,dydx\end{aligned}$$

$$\geq c_{N,s}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N}\varphi(t,x)\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\setminus U}\frac{d}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}\,dydx \geq d\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N}\varphi(t,x)\kappa_U(x)\,dx \tag{2.13}$$

with $\kappa_U(x)$ as defined in (2.9). Let $h(t) := \|\varphi(t,\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(U)}$ for $t\in[0,t_1]$. Combining (2.11), (2.12) and (2.13), we get

$$\begin{aligned} h'(t) &\leq -2(\gamma+c_\infty)\int\limits_U u(t,x)\varphi(t,x)\,dx - 2d\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N}\varphi(t,x)\kappa_U(x)\,dx \\ &\leq 2(\gamma+c_\infty)h(t) + 2d\int\limits_U[\gamma+c_\infty-\kappa_U(x)]\varphi(t,x)\,dx \qquad \text{for } t\in[0,t_1]. \end{aligned}$$

By (2.9) we conclude that $h'(t)\leq 2(\gamma+c_\infty)h(t)$ for $t\in[0,t_1]$. Since $h(0)=0$, we infer $h(t)=0$ for $t\in[0,t_1]$. This shows (2.10), as required. ☐

Remark 2.6. For entire supersolutions v of (2.3), a corresponding small volume maximum principle can be derived in a similar but much easier way. More precisely, for every $c_\infty,\gamma>0$ there exists $\delta>0$ such that for any open subset $U\subset\mathbb{R}^N$ with $|U|\leq\delta$, any time interval $T:=[t_0,t_1]$, any $c\in L^\infty(T\times U)$ with $\|c^+\|_{L^\infty}\leq c_\infty$ and any entire supersolution v of (2.3) on $T\times U$ we have

$$\|v^-(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq e^{-\gamma(t-t_0)}\|v^-(t_0,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(U)} \qquad \text{for all } t\in T. \tag{2.14}$$

As a consequence, we may readily derive the following weak maximum principle: If $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^N$ is an open subset, $T:=[t_0,t_1]$ a time interval, $c\in L^\infty(T\times\Omega)$ and v an entire supersolution of (2.3) on $T\times\Omega$ such that $v(t_0,x)\geq 0$ for a.e. $x\in\Omega$, then also $v(t,x)\geq 0$ for all $t\in T$ and almost every $x\in\Omega$. We will use this fact in the appendix of this paper.

2.2 A Harnack inequality for antisymmetric supersolutions

In this part we state a Harnack inequality for antisymmetric supersolutions of (2.3). We will derive this inequality – via a reformulation of the problem – from a recent result in [19]. We need to introduce some notation. Denote by $\triangle=\{(x,x)\,:\,x\in\mathbb{R}^N\}$ the diagonal in $\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N$. We fix $r_0\in(0,1]$ and $C_1,C_2>0$, and we consider a function $k:\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N\setminus\triangle\to[0,\infty)$ satisfying, for every $x,y\in\mathbb{R}^N$ with $x\neq y$,

$$\begin{aligned} &k(x,y)=k(y,x);\\ &k(x,y)\leq C_1|x-y|^{-N-2s};\\ &k(x,y)\geq C_2|x-y|^{-N-2s} \quad \text{if } |x-y|\leq r_0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

The quadratic form corresponding to this kernel is given by

$$\mathcal{E}_k(u,v)=\frac{1}{2}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N}(u(x)-u(y))(v(x)-v(y))k(x,y)\,dxdy \qquad \text{for } u,v\in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Recall the definition of $\mathscr{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ in (2.1). If $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is an open subset with $|U| < \infty$, $T \subset \mathbb{R}$ a time interval with nonempty interior and $g \in L^\infty(T \times U)$, we say that a function $v \in C(T, \mathscr{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)) \cap C^1(T, L^2(U))$ is a supersolution of the problem

$$\partial_t v(t,x) - P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (v(t,y) - v(t,x))k(x,y)\, dy = g \tag{2.16}$$

on $T \times U$ if

$$\mathscr{E}_k(v(t), \varphi) \geq \int_U [g(t,x) - \partial_t v(t,x)]\varphi(x)\, dx \qquad \text{for every } t \in T \text{ and every } \varphi \in \mathscr{H}_0^s(U),\ \varphi \geq 0.$$

Next we introduce notation for parabolic cylinders. For $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $r, \vartheta > 0$ we put $Q(r, \vartheta, t_0, x_0) := (t_0, t_0 + 8\vartheta) \times B_{2r}(x_0)$ and

$$Q^-(r, \vartheta, t_0, x_0) := (t_0, t_0 + \vartheta) \times B_r(x_0), \qquad Q^+(r, \vartheta, t_0, x_0) := (t_0 + 7\vartheta, t_0 + 8\vartheta) \times B_r(x_0).$$

In view of the scaling property noted in [19, Lemma 2.5 and Remark after Theorem 1.2], the following is a mere reformulation of a special case of [19, Theorem 1.1]. We note that the notion of supersolution considered in [19] is weaker than the one considered here.

Theorem 2.7. *Let* $r_0 \in (0,1]$ *and* $\vartheta, C_1, C_2 > 0$ *be given. Then there are constants* $c_i = c_i(N, s, r_0, \vartheta, C_1, C_2) > 0$, $i = 1,2$ *such that for any* $k : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \triangle \to [0, \infty)$ *satisfying the estimates (2.15), any* $(t_0, x_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$, *any* $g \in L^\infty(Q(r_0, \vartheta, t_0, x_0))$ *and any supersolution* v *of (2.16) on* $Q(r_0, \vartheta, t_0, x_0)$ *which is nonnegative in* $(t_0, t_0 + 8\vartheta) \times \mathbb{R}^N$ *we have*

$$\inf_{(t,x) \in Q^+(r_0, \vartheta, t_0, x_0)} v \geq c_1 [v]_{L^1(Q^-(r_0, \vartheta, t_0, x_0))} - c_2 \|g\|_{L^\infty(Q(r_0, \vartheta, t_0, x_0))}. \tag{2.17}$$

By an argument based on building chains of cylinders, we deduce the following Harnack inequality for general pairs of domains. We include the proof here since the argument is not completely standard. A similar argument has been detailed in [26, Appendix], but we need to argue somewhat differently since the triples of parabolic cylinders in Theorem 2.7 have a smaller overlap than the ones considered in [26].

Corollary 2.8. *Let* $r_0 \in (0,1]$, $R, \tau, \varepsilon > 0$ *and* $C_1, C_2 > 0$ *be given. Then there exist a positive constants* $c_i = c_i(N, s, r_0, C_1, C_2, R, \varepsilon, \tau) > 0$, $i = 1,2$ *with the following property:*
Let $k : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \triangle \to [0, \infty)$ *satisfy the estimates (2.15), and let* $D \subset\subset U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ *be a pair of domains such that* $|U| < \infty$, $\operatorname{dist}(D, \partial U) \geq 2r_0$, $|D| \geq \varepsilon$ *and* $\operatorname{diam}(D) \leq R$. *Moreover, let* $g \in L^\infty(T \times U)$ *and a supersolution* v *of (2.16) on* $T \times U$ *be given such that* v *is nonnegative in* $T \times \mathbb{R}^N$, *where* $T = [t_0, t_0 + 4\tau]$ *for some* $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. *Then we have*

$$\inf_{(t,x) \in T_+ \times D} v(t,x) \geq c_1 [v]_{L^1(T_- \times D)} - c_2 \|g\|_{L^\infty(T \times U)}, \tag{2.18}$$

where $T_+ = [t_0 + 3\tau, t_0 + 4\tau]$ *and* $T_- = [t_0 + \tau, t_0 + 2\tau]$.

Proof. We first note that there exist $n = n(N,R,r_0) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mu = \mu(N,R,r_0) > 0$ such that the following holds:
For every subset $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ with $\operatorname{diam} D \le R$ there exists a subset $S_D \subset D$ of $n+1$ points such that D is covered by the balls $B_{r_0}(x)$, $x \in S_D$, and for every two points $x_*, x^* \in S_D$ there exists a finite sequence $x_j \in S_D$, $j = 0,\dots,n$ such that

$$x_0 = x_*, \quad x_n = x^* \qquad \text{and} \qquad |B_{r_0}(x_j) \cap B_{r_0}(x_{j+1})| \ge \mu \quad \text{for } j = 0,\dots,n-1. \tag{2.19}$$

We now fix $D \subset\subset U \subset H$ as in the assertion, and we fix n,μ and a set S_D with the property above. Next, we put $\vartheta = \frac{\tau}{7}\min\{\frac{1}{17}, \frac{1}{n+3}\}$, and we claim the following:
For given $t_* \in [t_0+\tau, t_0+2\tau]$ and $t^* \in [t_0+3\tau, t_0+4\tau]$ there exists a finite sequence $t_* = s_0 < \dots < s_m = t^* - 8\vartheta$ such that

$$s_j + 7\vartheta \le s_{j+1} \le s_j + \frac{15}{2}\vartheta \qquad \text{for } j = 0,\dots,m-1 \tag{2.20}$$

and

$$\max\{14, n\} \le m \le \max\{51, 3(n+3)\} \tag{2.21}$$

Indeed, let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma \in [0, 7\vartheta)$ be such that $t_* + 7m\vartheta + \sigma = t^* - 8\vartheta$. The definition of ϑ and the restrictions on t_*, t^* then force (2.21), and (2.20) holds with $s_j := t_* + j\Big(7\vartheta + \frac{\sigma}{m}\Big)$ for $j = 0,\dots,m$. Next, we fix $t_* \in [t_0+\tau, t_0+2\tau]$, $x_* \in S_D$ such that

$$\|v\|_{L^1(Q_-(r_0,\vartheta,t_*,x_*))} = \max\Big\{ \|v\|_{L^1(Q_-(r_0,\vartheta,t,x))} \; : x \in S_D,\, t_0+\tau \le t \le t_0+2\tau \Big\}.$$

Since the cylinders

$$Q_-(r_0, \vartheta, t_0+\tau+l\vartheta, x), \qquad l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\},\, l \le \frac{\tau}{\vartheta},\, x \in S_D$$

cover $[t_0+\tau, t_0+2\tau] \times D$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
[v]_{L^1([t_0+\tau,t_0+2\tau]\times D)} &= \frac{1}{\tau|D|}\|v\|_{L^1([t_0+\tau,t_0+2\tau]\times D))} \le \frac{(n+1)(\frac{\tau}{\vartheta}+1)}{\tau\varepsilon}\|v\|_{L^1(Q_-(r_0,\vartheta,t_*,x_*))} \\
&= \frac{(n+1)(\frac{1}{\vartheta}+\frac{1}{\tau})}{\varepsilon}\vartheta|B_{r_0}(0)|\,[v]_{L^1(Q_-(r_0,\vartheta,t_*,x_*))} \\
&\le \kappa_1[v]_{L^1(Q_-(r_0,\vartheta,t_*,x_*))} \qquad \text{with} \quad \kappa_1 := \frac{2(n+1)|B_{r_0}(0)|}{\varepsilon}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

We now consider $t^* \in [t_0+3\tau, t_0+4\tau]$, $x \in D$ arbitrary. Then we choose $x^* \in S_D$ such that $x \in B_{r_0}(x^*)$, and we choose s_j, $j = 0,\dots,m$ with the properties (2.20) and (2.21). Moreover, we fix a sequence of points $x_j \in S_D$, $j = 0,\dots,m$ such that (2.19) holds with m in place of n. This may be done, since $m \ge n$, by repeating some of the points in the chain if necessary. We now define

$$Q_j := Q(r_0, \vartheta, s_j, x_j) \quad \text{and} \quad Q_j^{\pm} := Q^{\pm}(r_0, \vartheta, s_j, x_j) \qquad \text{for } j = 0,\dots,m.$$

We note that, by (2.19) and (2.20), we have

$$|Q_j^+ \cap Q_{j+1}^-| \geq \frac{\mu\vartheta}{2} \qquad \text{for } j = 0,\dots,m-1.$$

Hence we may estimate, using Theorem 2.7 and the fact that $Q_j \subset T \times U$ for $j = 0,\dots,m$,

$$\begin{aligned} c_1[v]_{L^1(Q_j^-)} &\leq \inf_{Q_j^+} v + c_2\|g\|_{L^\infty(Q_j)} \leq [v]_{L^1(Q_j^+\cap Q_{j+1}^-)} + c_2\|g\|_{L^\infty(T\times U)} \\ &\leq \frac{|Q_{j+1}^-|}{|Q_j^+ \cap Q_{j+1}^-|}[v]_{L^1(Q_{j+1}^-)} + c_2\|g\|_{L^\infty(T\times U)} \leq \frac{2|B_{r_0}(0)|}{\mu}[v]_{L^1(Q_{j+1}^-)} + c_2\|g\|_{L^\infty(T\times U)}. \end{aligned}$$

Iterating this estimate m times and using Theorem 2.7 once more, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} [v]_{L^1(Q_0^-)} &\leq \Big(\frac{2|B_{r_0}(0)|}{c_1\mu}\Big)^m [v]_{L^1(Q_m^-)} + \frac{c_2}{c_1}\sum_{k=0}^{m-1}\Big(\frac{2|B_{r_0}(0)|}{c_1\mu}\Big)^k \|g\|_{L^\infty(T\times U)} \\ &\leq \Big(\frac{2|B_{r_0}(0)|}{\mu}\Big)^m c_1^{-(m+1)} \inf_{Q_m^+} v + \frac{c_2}{c_1}\sum_{k=0}^{m}\Big(\frac{2|B_{r_0}(0)|}{c_1\mu}\Big)^k \|g\|_{L^\infty(T\times U)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, since $(t^*,x^*) \in Q_m^+$, we conclude by (2.22) that

$$v(t^*,x^*) \geq \inf_{Q_m^+} v \geq \hat{c}_1[v]_{L^1(Q_0^-} - \tilde{c}_2\|g\|_{L^\infty(T\times U)} \geq \frac{\hat{c}_1}{\kappa_1}[v]_{L^1([t_0+\tau,t_0+2\tau]\times D)} - \tilde{c}_2\|g\|_{L^\infty(T\times U)}$$

with

$$\hat{c}_1 = \Big(\frac{2|B_{r_0}(0)|}{\mu}\Big)^{-m} c_1^{m+1} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tilde{c}_2 = \hat{c}_1\frac{c_2}{c_1}\sum_{k=0}^{m}\Big(\frac{2|B_{r_0}(0)|}{c_1\mu}\Big)^k$$

Hence the claim follows with $\tilde{c}_1 = \frac{\hat{c}_1}{\kappa_1}$ and $\tilde{c}_2$ as above. Note that $\tilde{c}_1$ and $\tilde{c}_2$ only depend – via n, m, μ, c_1, c_2 and κ_1 – on the given quantities $N,s,r_0,R,\varepsilon,\tau,C_1$ and C_2. ☐

The main goal of this subsection is to deduce the following Harnack inequality for entire antisymmetric supersolutions of (2.3).

Theorem 2.9. *Let $r_0 \in (0,1]$, $c_\infty,R,\tau,\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Then there exist positive constants $K_i = K_i(N,s,r_0,c_\infty,\varepsilon,R,\tau) > 0$, $i = 1,2$ with the following property:*
If $D \subset\subset U \subset H$ is a pair of domains with $|U| < \infty$, $\operatorname{dist}(D,\partial U) \geq 4r_0$, $\operatorname{diam}(D) \leq R$, $|D| \geq \varepsilon$, and v is entire antisymmetric supersolution of (2.3) on $T \times U$ with $T = [t_0,t_0+4\tau]$ for some $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c \in L^\infty(T\times U)$ with $\|c\|_{L^\infty} \leq c_\infty$ such that $v(t) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $t \in T$, then

$$\inf_{(t,x)\in T_+\times D} v(t,x) \geq K_1[v^+]_{L^1(T_-\times D)} - K_2\|v^-\|_{L^\infty(T\times U)}, \tag{2.23}$$

where $T_+ = [t_0+3\tau,t_0+4\tau]$ and $T_- = [t_0+\tau,t_0+2\tau]$.

The first step in the derivation of this result is the following lemma.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\beta > 0$ be given, and put $H_\beta := \{x \in H : \operatorname{dist}(x,\partial H) > \beta\}$. Then there exists a continuous kernel function $k : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \triangle \to [0,\infty)$ – depending on β – with the following properties:*

(i) $k(x,y) = k(y,x)$ *for all* $x,y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $x \neq y$;

(ii) $0 \le k(x,y) \le c_{N,s}|x-y|^{-N-2s}$, *for all* $x,y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $x \neq y$;

(iii) $k(x,y) \ge (1-5^{-N/2-s})c_{N,s}|x-y|^{-N-2s}$ *for* $x,y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ *with* $0 < |x-y| \le \frac{\beta}{2}$;

(iv) *For any antisymmetric* $v \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ *and any* $\varphi \in \mathscr{H}_0^s(H_\beta)$ *we have*

$$\mathscr{E}(v,\varphi) = \mathscr{E}_k(\tilde{v},\varphi) + 2\int_{H_\beta} \kappa_H(x)\tilde{v}(x)\varphi(x)\,dx \tag{2.24}$$

with $\kappa_H(x)$ *as given in Lemma 2.3 and* $\tilde{v} = v1_H \in \mathscr{H}_0^s(H)$.

Proof. We may assume without loss that $H = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x_1 > 0\}$. For simplicity, we write $\bar{x} = Q(x) = (-x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. We consider $J(x,y)$ as defined in Lemma 2.3. Obviously we have

$$0 \le J(x,y) \le c_{N,s}|x-y|^{-N-2s} \qquad \text{for } x,y \in \mathbb{R}^N,\ x \neq y. \tag{2.25}$$

whereas, by Lemma 2.3

$$J(x,y) \ge \frac{(1-5^{-N/2-s})c_{N,s}}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} \quad \text{for } x,y \in H \text{ with } 0 < |x-y| \le \frac{\beta}{2} \text{ and } \min\{x_1,y_1\} \ge \frac{\beta}{2}. \tag{2.26}$$

To define k with the asserted properties, we set

$$g : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \triangle \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad g(x,y) := \begin{cases} J(x,y) & (x,y) \in H \times H \setminus \triangle, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$s : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad s(x,y) := \begin{cases} \min\{\beta - x_1, \beta - y_1\}, & \text{if } \min\{\beta - x_1, \beta - y_1\} \ge 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

Finally, we set $k(x,y) := g(x + s(x,y)e_1, y + s(x,y)e_1)$ for $x,y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $x \neq y$. Then k is continuous, and properties (i) and (ii) follow directly by construction and (2.25). To see (iii), we note that if $0 < |x-y| \le \frac{\beta}{2}$ then also $|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}| \le \frac{\beta}{2}$, where $\tilde{x} = x + s(x,y)e_1$ and $\tilde{y} = y + s(x,y)e_1$. Furthermore we have that $\max\{x_1,y_1\} \ge \beta$ and therefore $\min\{x_1,y_1\} \ge \frac{\beta}{2}$. Consequently,

$$k(x,y) = g(\tilde{x},\tilde{y}) \ge (1-5^{-N/2-s})c_{N,s}|\tilde{x}-\tilde{y}|^{-N/2-s} = (1-5^{-N-2s})c_{N,s}|x-y|^{-N-2s}$$

by (2.26). It remains to show (iv): So let $v \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be antisymmetric, and let $\varphi \in \mathscr{H}_0^s(H_\beta)$. Then Lemma 2.3 gives

$$\mathscr{E}(v,\varphi) = \frac{1}{2}\int_H\int_H (\tilde{v}(x) - \tilde{v}(y))(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y))J(x,y)\,dx\,dy + 2\int_{H_\beta} \kappa_H(x)\tilde{v}(x)\varphi(x)\,dx, \tag{2.27}$$

whereas, since $\varphi \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus H_\beta$,

$$\int_H \int_H (\tilde{v}(x)-\tilde{v}(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))J(x,y)\ dx\ dy = \int_H \int_{H_\beta} \dots dx\ dy + \int_{H_\beta} \int_{H \setminus H_\beta} \dots dx\ dy. \tag{2.28}$$

If $x \in H_\beta$, then for $y \in H$ we have $s(x,y) = 0$ and thus $J(x,y) = g(x,y) = k(x,y)$, while for $y \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus H$ we have that $k(x,y) = 0$. Hence we can rewrite the first integral of the RHS of (2.28) as

$$\int_H \int_{H_\beta} (\tilde{v}(x)-\tilde{v}(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))J(x,y)\ dx\ dy$$
$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{H_\beta} (\tilde{v}(x)-\tilde{v}(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))k(x,y)\ dx\ dy$$

Similarly, if $y \in H_\beta$, then for $x \in H \setminus H_\beta$ we have $s(x,y) = 0$ and thus $J(x,y) = g(x,y) = k(x,y)$, while for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus H$ we have $k(x,y) = 0$. Hence we may rewrite the second integral of the RHS of (2.28) as

$$\int_{H_\beta} \int_{H \setminus H_\beta} (\tilde{v}(x)-\tilde{v}(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))J(x,y)\ dxdy = \int_{H_\beta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus H_\beta} (\tilde{v}(x)-\tilde{v}(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))k(x,y)\ dxdy$$
$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus H_\beta} (\tilde{v}(x)-\tilde{v}(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))k(x,y)\ dxdy,$$

where the last equality follows again since $\varphi = 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus H_\beta$. Combining these identities, we get

$$\int_H \int_H (\tilde{v}(x)-\tilde{v}(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))J(x,y)\ dxdy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\tilde{v}(x)-\tilde{v}(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))k(x,y)\ dxdy,$$

and together with (2.27) it follows that

$$\mathscr{E}(v,\tilde{\varphi}) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\tilde{v}(x)-\tilde{v}(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))k(x,y)\ dy + 2 \int_{H_\beta} \kappa_H(x)\tilde{v}(x)\varphi(x)\ dx,$$

as claimed in (2.24). ☐

We may now complete the

Proof of Theorem 2.9. Put $\beta = 2r_0$, $U_0 = \{x \in U\ :\ \mathrm{dist}(x,D) < \beta\} \subset\subset U$, and let k be the function given by Lemma 2.10 for this choice of β. Let v be an antisymmetric supersolution of (2.3) on $T \times U$, and consider

$$\tilde{v} : T \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad \tilde{v}(t,x) = \begin{cases} v(t,x), & (t,x) \in T \times H \\ 0, & (t,x) \notin T \times H. \end{cases}$$

Since $U_0 \subset H_\beta$, Lemma 2.10(iv) implies that

$$\mathcal{E}_k(\tilde{v}(t),\varphi) \geq \int\limits_{U_0} \Big([c(t,x) - 2\kappa_H(x)]\tilde{v}(t) - \partial_t \tilde{v}(t) \Big) \varphi \, dx \quad \text{for any } \varphi \in \mathcal{H}_0^s(U_0),\ \varphi \geq 0 \text{ and } t \in T,$$

where $0 \leq \kappa_H(x) \leq \frac{4^s\Gamma(\frac{1}{2}+s)}{\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma(1-s)}\beta^{-2s}$ for $x \in H_\beta$ by Lemma 2.3. Let $d := 2\frac{4^s\Gamma(\frac{1}{2}+s)}{\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma(1-s)}\beta^{-2s} + c_\infty$ and $\sigma := \|v^-\|_{L^\infty(T\times U)}$, and define $w(t,x) := e^{d(t-t_0)}[\tilde{v}(t,x) + \sigma]$ for $t \in T, x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Setting $w(t) = w(t,\cdot)$ as usual, we observe that $w(t) \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^N$ for all $t \in T$. Moreover, for any $t \in T$ and any nonnegative $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_0^s(U_0)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_k(w(t),\varphi) &= e^{d(t-t_0)}\mathcal{E}_k(\tilde{v}(t),\varphi) \\
&\geq \int\limits_{U_0} \Big([d + c(t,x) - 2\kappa_H(x)]w(t,x) - \partial_t w(t,x) - e^{d(t-t_0)}\sigma[c(t,x) - 2\kappa_H(x)] \Big) \varphi(x)\, dx \\
&\geq \int\limits_{U_0} \Big(e^{d(t-t_0)}\sigma[2\kappa_H(x) - c(t,x)] - \partial_t w(t,x) \Big) \varphi(x)\, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence w is a nonnegative supersolution of (2.16) on $T \times U_0$ with $g(t,x) = e^{d(t-t_0)}\sigma[2\kappa_H(x) - c(t,x)]$. Applying Corollary 2.8 with U_0 in place of U (noting that $\operatorname{dist}(D,\partial U_0) = \beta = 2r_0$) and using the properties of k given by Lemma 2.10, we find $c_i = c_i(N,s,r_0,R,\varepsilon,\tau) > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{T_+\times D} w(t,x) \geq c_1[w]_{L^1(T_-\times D)} - c_2\|g\|_{L^\infty(T\times U_0)}$$

We note furthermore that $[w]_{L^1(T_-\times D)} \geq [v+\sigma]_{L^1(T_-\times D)} \geq [v^+]_{L^1(T_-\times D)}$ and

$$\inf_{T_+\times D} w \leq e^{4\tau d}\Big(\inf_{T_+\times D} v + \sigma\Big),$$

so that

$$\inf_{T_+\times D} v \geq c_1 e^{-4\tau d}[v^+]_{L^1(T_+\times D)} - e^{-4\tau d}c_2\|g\|_{L^\infty(T\times U_0)} - \sigma$$

Noting furthermore that $\|g\|_{L^\infty(T\times U_0)} \leq e^{4\tau d}\sigma d$, we conclude that

$$\inf_{T_+\times D} v \geq c_1 e^{-4\tau d}[v^+]_{L^1(T_+\times D)} - (c_2 d + 1)\sigma.$$

Hence the assertion follows with $K_1 = c_1 e^{-4\tau d}$ and $K_2 = c_2 d + 1$. Note that both constants only depend on N, s, r_0, c_∞, ε, R and τ. ☐

2.3 A lower bound based on a subsolution estimate

The aim of this subsection is to prove the following result.

Proposition 2.11. *Let $\rho > 0$, and let Ψ denote the unique positive eigenfunction of the problem*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} -\Delta\Psi &=& \lambda_1\Psi & \text{in } B_\rho(0), \\ \Psi &=& 0 & \text{on } \partial B_\rho(0), \end{array} \right. \tag{2.29}$$

corresponding to the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1 > 0$ *with* $\|\Psi\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(0))} = 1$*. Moreover, let* $c_\infty > 0$*. Then there exist* $\gamma = \gamma(N,s,\rho,c_\infty) > 0$ *and* $q = q(N,s,\rho,c_\infty) > 0$ *with the following property. If* $T := [t_0,t_1] \subset \mathbb{R}$*,* $x_0 \in H$ *with* $\operatorname{dist}(x_0,\partial H) \geq 2\rho$*,* $\sigma_0 > 0$ *and* $\sigma_1 \geq q\sigma_0$ *and an antisymmetric supersolution* v *of (2.3) on* $T \times B_\rho(x_0)$ *with* $\|c\|_{L^\infty(T\times B_\rho(x_0))} \leq c_\infty$ *are given such that*

(i) $v(t) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ *for* $t \in T$*,*

(ii) v *is nonnegative in* $T \times B_{2\rho}(x_0)$*,*

(iii) $\|v^-(t)\|_{L^\infty(H\setminus B_{2\rho}(x_0))} \leq \sigma_0 e^{-(\gamma+1)(t-t_0)}$ *for* $t \in T$*,*

(iv) $v(t_0,x) \geq \sigma_1 \Psi(x-x_0)$ *for* $x \in B_{\rho(x_0)}$*,*

then

$$v(t,x) \geq \sigma_1 e^{-\gamma(t-t_0)}\Psi(x-x_0) \qquad \textit{for } (t,x) \in T \times B_{\rho(x_0)}. \tag{2.30}$$

To show this estimate, we consider the Caffarelli-Silvestre extension of a function $v \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ which was introduced in [9]. For this we consider the usual half space $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+ := \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R} : y > 0\}$. For a domain $U_+ \subset \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+$, the weighted Sobolev space $H^1(U_+;y^{1-2s})$ is given as the set of all functions $w \in H^1_{loc}(U_+)$ such that

$$\int_{U_+} y^{1-2s}\left(|w|^2 + |\nabla w|^2\right) d(x,y) < \infty.$$

In the following, we only consider the case $U_+ = U \times (0,\infty)$ for some domain $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. Then we have a well defined continuous trace map $\operatorname{tr} : H^1(U_+;y^{1-2s}) \to H^s(U)$, see e.g. [8]. We also recall the following integration by parts formula. If $h \in H^1(U_+;y^{1-2s}) \cap C(\overline{U}_+)$ and $\tilde{w} \in H^1(U_+;y^{1-2s}) \cap C^2(U_+) \cap C^1(\partial U \times (0,\infty))$ are such that $h \equiv 0$ on $\partial U \times (0,\infty))$ and the limit $m(x) := \lim_{y\to 0} y^{1-2s}\partial_y \tilde{w}(x,y)$ exists in uniform sense for $x \in U$, then

$$\int_{U_+} y^{1-2s}\nabla\tilde{w}\nabla h\, d(x,y) = -\int_U m \operatorname{tr}(h)\, dx - \int_{U_+} [\operatorname{div}(y^{1-2s}\nabla\tilde{w}]h\, d(x,y). \tag{2.31}$$

Formally introducing the operator $L_s := \operatorname{div}(y^{1-2s}\nabla)$, we say that a function $w \in H^1(U_+;y^{1-2s})$ is (weakly) L_s*-harmonic* on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+$ if

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s}\nabla w\nabla\varphi\, dz = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+;y^{1-2s}) \text{ with } \operatorname{tr}(\varphi) = 0.$$

Standard elliptic regularity then shows that $w \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)$ and that $\operatorname{div}(y^{1-2s}\nabla w) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+$ in pointwise sense. We finally recall that every function $v \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ has a L_s-harmonic extension $w \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+;y^{1-2s})$ given by

$$w(x,y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v(z)G(x-z,y)\, dz \qquad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^N, y > 0, \tag{2.32}$$

where $G(x,y) := c_{N,s}y^{2s}\left(|x|^2 + y^2\right)^{-\frac{N+2s}{2}}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N, y > 0$, see e.g. [9]. We need the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.12. *Let $\rho > 0$. Then there exists constants $\tilde{c}_1 = \tilde{c}_1(N,s,\rho)$ and $\tilde{c}_2 = \tilde{c}_2(N,s,\rho)$ such that the following holds:*
If $x_0 \in H$ satisfies $\operatorname{dist}(x_0,H) \geq 2\rho$ and $v \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is a continuous antisymmetric function such that $v \geq 0$ on $B_{2\rho}(x_0)$, then

$$\frac{w(x,y)}{y^{2s}} \geq \tilde{c}_1 \Big[\int\limits_{B_\rho(x_0)} (v(z))^{\frac{1}{2}}\, dz \Big]^2 - \tilde{c}_2 \|v^-\|_{L^\infty(H\setminus B_{2\rho}(x_0))} \quad \textit{for } (x,y) \in B_\rho(x_0) \times (0,1], \tag{2.33}$$

where w is the L_s-harmonic extension of v.

Proof. Since v is antisymmetric, we have, by a simple change of variable,

$$w(x,y) = \int\limits_H [G(x-z,y) - G(x-Q(z),y)]v(z)\, dz \qquad \text{for } x \in H. \tag{2.34}$$

For $x,z \in H$ and $y > 0$ we have

$$G(x-z,y) \geq G(x-z,y) - G(x-Q(z),y) = G(x-z,y)\left(1 - \left(\frac{|x-z|^2+y^2}{|x-Q(z)|^2+y^2}\right)^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}\right) \tag{2.35}$$

Moreover, for $x,z \in B_\rho(x_0)$ we have $|x-z|^2 \leq 4\rho^2$ and $|x-Q(z)|^2 \geq |x-z|^2 + 4\rho^2$, so that

$$G(x-z,y) - G(x-Q(z),y) \geq c_1\, G(x-z,y) \qquad \text{for } y \in (0,1] \tag{2.36}$$

with

$$c_1 = 1 - \left(1 + \frac{4\rho^2}{1+4\rho^2}\right)^{-\frac{N+2s}{2}} = 1 - \left(\frac{1+4\rho^2}{1+8\rho^2}\right)^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}.$$

Combining (2.34), (2.35) and (2.36) and using that $v \geq 0$ on $B_{2\rho}(x_0)$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{w(x,y)}{c_{N,s}y^{2s}} &\geq c_1 \int\limits_{B_\rho(x_0)} v(z)(|x-z|^2+y^2)^{-\frac{N+2s}{2}}\, dz - \|v^-\|_{L^\infty(H\setminus B_{2\rho}(x_0))} \int\limits_{H\setminus B_{2\rho}(x_0)} (|x-z|^2+y^2)^{-\frac{N+2s}{2}}\, dz \\
&\geq \frac{c_1 \left(\int_{B_\rho(x_0)} v^{\frac{1}{2}}(z)\, dz\right)^2}{\int_{B_\rho(x_0)} (|x-z|^2+y^2)^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}\, dz} - \|v^-\|_{L^\infty(H\setminus B_{2\rho}(x_0))} N\omega_N \int\limits_\rho^\infty r^{-1-2s}\, dr \\
&\geq \frac{c_1 \left(\int_{B_\rho(x_0)} v^{\frac{1}{2}}(z)\, dz\right)^2}{\int_{B_\rho(x_0)} (|z|^2+1)^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}\, dz} - c_2 \|v^-\|_{L^\infty(H\setminus B_{2\rho(x_0)})} \qquad \text{for } x \in B_\rho(x_0) \text{ and } y \in (0,1]
\end{aligned}$$

with $c_2 := \frac{N\omega_N}{2s}(\rho)^{-2s}$. Since also

$$\int\limits_{B_\rho(0)} (|z|^2+1)^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}\, dz = N\omega_N \int\limits_0^\rho (r^2+1)^{\frac{N+2s}{2}} r^{N-1}\, dr \leq N\omega_N \big(\rho^2+1\big)^{\frac{3N+2s}{2}}$$

for $x,z \in B_\rho$ and $y \in (0,1]$, we conclude that

$$\frac{w(x,y)}{c_{N,s}y^{2s}} \geq \frac{c_1}{\omega_N}\left(\rho^2+1\right)^{-\frac{3N+2s}{2}}\Big(\int\limits_{B_1} v^{\frac{1}{2}}(z)\,dz\Big)^2 - \tilde{c}_2\|v^-\|_{L^\infty(H\setminus B_2)}$$

for $x \in B_1$ and $y \in (0,1]$. Hence the claim follows with $\tilde{c}_1 = \frac{c_1 c_{N,s}}{\omega_N}\left(\rho^2+1\right)^{-\frac{3N+2s}{2}}$ and $\tilde{c}_2 = c_2 c_{N,s}$. ☐

Lemma 2.13. *Let $U \subset H$ be a Lipschitz domain, $T := (t_0,T_0)$, $t_0 < T_0$, $c \in L^\infty(T\times U)$, and let v be a supersolution of (2.3) on $T\times U$ such that $v(t) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $t \in T$. Moreover, let $w(t) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+, y^{1-2s})$ be the L_s-harmonic extension of $v(t)$ given by (2.32) for each fixed time $t \in T$. Then for every nonnegative $\Phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+, y^{1-2s})$ with $\varphi := \mathrm{tr}(\Phi) \in \mathscr{H}^s_0(U)$ and every $t \in T$ we have*

$$\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s}\nabla w \nabla\Phi\, d(x,y) \geq \int\limits_U (c(t,x)v - \partial_t v)\varphi\, dx. \tag{2.37}$$

Proof. In case Φ is the L_s-harmonic extension of φ, we have

$$\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s}\nabla w\nabla\Phi\, d(x,y) = \mathscr{E}(w,\varphi)$$

(see e.g. [9]) and therefore (2.37) is true. On the other hand, since w is L_s-harmonic,

$$\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s}\nabla w\nabla\Theta\, d(x,y) = 0 \qquad \text{for every } \Theta \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N_+, y^{1-2s}) \text{ with } \mathrm{tr}(\Theta) = 0.$$

Hence the assertion follows. ☐

Lemma 2.14. *Let $\rho > 0$, $c_\infty > 0$, and let Ψ be defined as in Proposition 2.11 w.r.t. ρ. Then there exists $\gamma = \gamma(N,s,\rho,c_\infty) > 0$ such that the following holds:*
If $T = [t_0,t_1] \subset \mathbb{R}$, $x_0 \in H$ with $\mathrm{dist}(x_0,\partial H) \geq 2\rho$ and $c \in L^\infty([t_0,t_1]\times B_\rho(x_0))$ with $\|c\|_{L^\infty} \leq c_\infty$ are given and v is an antisymmetric supersolution of (2.3) on $[t_0,t_1]\times B_\rho(x_0)$ such that $v(t) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $t \in [t_0,t_1]$,

$$v(t_0,x) \geq \sigma\Psi(x-x_0) \qquad \text{for } x \in B_\rho(x_0) \text{ with some constant } \sigma > 0, \tag{2.38}$$

and

$$\text{the } L_s\text{-harmonic extension } w \text{ of } v \text{ is nonnegative on } B_\rho(x_0)\times[0,1] \text{ for all } t \in [t_0,t_1], \tag{2.39}$$

then

$$v(t,x) \geq \sigma e^{-\gamma(t-t_0)}\Psi(x-x_0) \qquad \text{for } (t,x) \in T\times B_\rho(x_0).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $x_0 = 0$, $t_0 = 0$ and $\sigma = 1$, and we put $B_\rho = B_\rho(0)$. Let $\lambda_1 > 0$ be defined by (2.29), and let $f : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ denote the solution of the initial value problem

$$(D) \qquad \begin{cases} f'' + \dfrac{1-2s}{y} f' - \lambda_1 f = 0, \\ f(0) = 1, \\ \lim\limits_{y\to\infty} f(y) = 0, \end{cases}$$

which is uniquely given by

$$f(y) = \kappa_1 y^{2s} \int_0^\infty \frac{\cos(\tau)}{(\tau^2 + \lambda_1 y^2)^{\frac{1+2s}{2}}}\, d\tau \qquad \text{for } y \ge 0 \text{ with } \kappa_1 = \frac{2\lambda_1^s}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{1+s}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{s}{2})}.$$

We note that f is a scalar multiple of a rescaled MacDonald function (or modified Bessel function of the second kind), see e.g. [35]. We also note that f is strictly decreasing on $[0,\infty)$. Moreover, the limit

$$\kappa_2 := \lim_{y\to 0} \frac{y^{1-2s} f'(y)}{1 - f(1)} \le 0$$

exists and only depends on s and ρ (via λ_1). We now put $\gamma = c_\infty - \kappa_2 + 1$, and we let

$$\tilde{w} : [0,t_1] \times \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+ \to \mathbb{R} \text{ be defined by } \tilde{w}(t,x,y) = \begin{cases} e^{-\gamma t} \Psi(x) \dfrac{f(y) - f(1)}{1 - f(1)}, & x \in B_\rho; \\ 0, & x \notin B_\rho. \end{cases}$$

Putting $\tilde{w}(t) = \tilde{w}(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ as usual, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} L_s \tilde{w}(t) &= \frac{1}{1-f(1)} e^{-\gamma t} \Big(y^{1-2s} \Delta_x \tilde{w} + (1-2s) y^{-2s} \partial_y \tilde{w} + y^{1-2s} \partial_{yy} \tilde{w} \Big) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-f(1)} e^{-\gamma t} y^{1-2s} \Psi(x) \Big(-\lambda_1 f + \frac{1-2s}{y} f' + f'' + \lambda_1 f(1) \Big) \ge 0 \quad \text{on } B_\rho \times (0,\infty) \end{aligned} \tag{2.40}$$

for $t \in [0,t_1]$. Moreover, we have

$$\tilde{w}(0,x,0) = \Psi(x) \le v(0,x) \quad \text{for } x \in B_\rho, \tag{2.41}$$

$$\lim_{y\to 0} y^{1-2s} \partial_y \tilde{w}(t,x,0) = \kappa_2 e^{-\gamma t} \Psi(x) = \kappa_2 \tilde{w}(t,x,0) \quad \text{for } x \in B_\rho,\ t \in [0,t_1], \text{ and} \tag{2.42}$$

$$\tilde{w}(t) \equiv 0 \le w(t) \qquad \text{on } \partial B_\rho \times (0,1] \cup B_\rho \times \{1\}$$

by assumption and by construction of $\tilde{w}$. In the following, we consider

$$h(t) \in H^1 \in (\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+, y^{1-2s}) \quad \text{defined by} \quad h(t,x) = \begin{cases} (w - \tilde{w})^-(t,x,y), & (x,y) \in B_\rho \times [0,1], \\ 0, & \text{elsewhere}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, we will write g resp. $\tilde{v}$ for the traces of h and $\tilde{w}$, respectively. Then, as a consequence of (2.31), (2.37), (2.40) and (2.42), we have

$$\begin{aligned}0 &\geq -\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s}|\nabla h|^2 d(x,y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s}\nabla w \nabla h d(x,y) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s}\nabla \tilde{w}\nabla h d(x,y)\\
&\geq \int_{B_\rho} \Big([c(t,x)v-\partial_t v]g+\kappa_2\tilde{v}g\Big)\,dx = \int_{B_\rho}\Big([c(t,x)(v-\tilde{v})-\partial_t(v-\tilde{v})]g+[\kappa_2+c(t,x)+\gamma]\tilde{v}g\Big)\,dx\\
&\geq -c_\infty \int_{B_\rho} g^2(t,x)\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int g^2(t,x)\,dx \qquad \text{for } t\in[0,t_1].\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\frac{d}{dt}\int_{B_\rho} g^2(t,x)\,dx \leq 2c_\infty \int_{B_\rho} g^2(t,x)\,dx$ for $t\in[0,t_1]$. Since furthermore $\int_{B_\rho} g^2(0,x)\,dx = 0$ as a consequence of (2.41), we conclude that $\int_{B_\rho} g^2(t,x)\,dx = 0$ and therefore $g(t)\equiv 0$ on B_ρ for all $t\in T$. Hence $v(t,x)\geq e^{-\gamma t}\Psi(x)$ for $(t,x)\in T\times B_\rho(0)$, as claimed. ☐

We may now complete the

Proof of Proposition 2.11. For given $\rho, c_\infty > 0$, let $\tilde{c}_i$, $i=1,2$ be given by Lemma 2.12, and let γ be given by Lemma 2.14. Moreover, let

$$q = \frac{2\tilde{c}_2}{\tilde{c}_1}\Big[\int_{B_\rho(0)} \Psi(z)^{\frac{1}{2}}\,dz\Big]^{-2}$$

Next, let $T := [t_0,t_1] \subset R$, $\sigma_0 > 0$ and $\sigma_1 \geq q\sigma_0$, and let v be an antisymmetric supersolution of (2.3) on $T\times B_\rho(x_0)$ satisfying assumptions (i)- (iii). Suppose by contradiction that

$$v(t,x) = \sigma_2 e^{-\gamma(t_*-t_0)}\Psi(x_*-x_0) \quad \text{for some } \sigma_2\in(\frac{\sigma_1}{2},\sigma_1),\ t_*\in T \text{ and } x_*\in B_\rho(x_0). \tag{2.43}$$

We may assume that $t_* > t_0$ is chosen minimally with this property, so that

$$v(t,x)\geq \sigma_2 e^{-\gamma(t-t_0)}\Psi(x-x_0) \qquad \text{for } (t,x)\in[t_0,t_*]\times B_{\rho(x_0)}.$$

Let w denote the L_s-harmonic extension of v given by (2.34) for each fixed time $t\in T$. Then Lemma 2.12 implies that

$$\begin{aligned}y^{-2s}w(t,x,y) &\geq \tilde{c}_1\Big[\int_{B_\rho(x_0)} (v(t,z))^{\frac{1}{2}}\,dz\Big]^2 - \tilde{c}_2\|v^-(t)\|_{L^\infty(H\setminus B_{2\rho}(x_0))}\\
&\geq \tilde{c}_1\sigma_2 e^{-\gamma(t-t_0)}\Big[\int_{B_\rho(0)} \Psi(z)^{\frac{1}{2}}\,dz\Big]^2 - \tilde{c}_2\sigma_0 e^{-(\gamma+1)(t-t_0)}\\
&\geq \sigma_0 e^{-\gamma(t-t_0)}\Big(\frac{q\tilde{c}_1}{2}\Big[\int_{B_\rho(0)} \Psi(z)^{\frac{1}{2}}\,dz\Big]^2 - \tilde{c}_2\Big)\geq 0\end{aligned}$$

for $t\in[t_0,t_*]$ and $(x,y)\in B_\rho(x_0)\times(0,1]$. Hence, by Lemma 2.14,

$$v(t,x)\geq \sigma_1 e^{-\gamma(t-t_0)}\Psi(x-x_0) \qquad \text{for } (t,x)\in[t_0,t_*]\times B_\rho(x_0).$$

This contradicts (2.43), and thus the proof is finished. ☐

2.4 *Main Result on entire antisymmetric supersolutions*

We recall from Section 1.1 that, for a subset $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $\operatorname{inrad}(D)$ denote the supremum of all $r > 0$ such that every connected component of D contains a ball $B_r(x_0)$ with $x_0 \in D$. Note that $\operatorname{inrad}(D) \geq \rho > 0$ implies that every connected component of D has at least measure $|B_\rho(0)|$, so in this case D has only finitely many components if it has finite measure.

Theorem 2.15. *Let $\rho > 0$ and $c_\infty > 0$ be given. Moreover, let $\gamma = \gamma(N,s,\rho,c_\infty) > 0$, $q = q(N,s,\rho,c_\infty) > 0$ be as in Proposition 2.11, and let $\delta > 0$ be such that the conclusions of Proposition 2.4 hold with $\gamma+1$ in place of γ.*
Then for any $\tau, r_0, R > 0$ there exists $\mu > 0$ such that the following holds:
If $D \subset\subset U \subset H$ are open sets with $|U| < \infty$, $\operatorname{inrad}(D) > 2\rho$, $\operatorname{diam}(D) \leq R$, $|U \setminus \overline{D}| < \delta$ and $\operatorname{dist}(D, \partial U) > 4r_0$ and if v is an entire antisymmetric supersolution of (2.3) on $[t_0,\infty) \times U$ for some $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\|c\|_{L^\infty([t_0,\infty)\times U)} \leq c_\infty$ such that $v(t) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $t \in [t_0,\infty)$, v is nonnegative on $[t_0, t_0+8\tau] \times \overline{D}$ and

$$\|v^-(t_0,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(U\setminus\overline{D})} \leq \mu [v]_{L^1((t_0+\tau,t_0+2\tau)\times D_*)} \quad \text{for each connected component } D_* \text{ of } D, \tag{2.44}$$

then:

(i) $v(t,x) > 0$ *for all* $(t,x) \in [t_0,\infty) \times \overline{D}$

(ii) $\|v^-(t)\|_{L^\infty(U)} \to 0$ *for* $t \to \infty$.

Proof. We let $\rho, \gamma, q, \delta, \tau, R$ be given with the properties stated in the theorem, and we put $\varepsilon = |B_{2\rho}(0)|$. Let K_1, K_2 – depending on these quantities – be given as in Theorem 2.9. We fix $\mu > 0$ sufficiently small such that

$$\Big(\frac{K_1}{\mu} - K_2\Big) > q \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{K_1|B_\rho(0)|}{(2R)^N}\Big(\frac{K_1}{\mu} - K_2\Big)[\Psi]_{L^1(B_\rho(0))} - K_2 > 0, \tag{2.45}$$

where Ψ is given in Proposition 2.11 depending on ρ. Next, we consider $D \subset\subset U \subset H$ and an antisymmetric supersolution v of (2.3) on $[t_0,\infty) \times U$ with the properties stated in the theorem, which implies in particular that $\varepsilon \leq |D_*| \leq (2R)^N$ for every connected component D_* of D. We put $\sigma_0 = \|v^-(t_0)\|_{L^\infty(U\setminus\overline{D})}$ and

$$T_0 := \sup\{t \geq t_0 + 8\tau \,:\, v > 0 \text{ in } [t_0,t) \times \overline{D}\},$$

so that $t_0 + 8\tau \leq T_0 \leq \infty$ by assumption. Applying Proposition 2.4, we get

$$\|v^-(t)\|_{L^\infty(U)} = \|v^-(t)\|_{L^\infty(U\setminus\overline{D})} \leq \sigma_0 e^{-(\gamma+1)(t-t_0)} \qquad \text{for all } t \in [t_0, T_0). \tag{2.46}$$

To prove (i), we suppose by contradiction that $T_0 < \infty$. Then there exists a connected component D_* of D and $x_* \in \overline{D}_*$ such that

$$v > 0 \text{ in } [t_0, T_0) \times \overline{D}_* \qquad \text{and} \qquad v(T_0, x_*) = 0. \tag{2.47}$$

Let U_* be the connected component of U with $D_* \subset U_*$. Since $v \geq 0$ on $[t_0, t_0 + 8\tau) \times \overline{D_*}$, we have, by Theorem 2.9, (2.44) and Proposition 2.4,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{[t_0+3\tau, t_0+4\tau]\times\overline{D_*}} v \geq K_1 [v^+]_{L^1([t_0+\tau, t_0+2\tau]\times D_*)} - K_2 \|v^-\|_{L^\infty([t_0,t_0+4\tau]\times U_*)} \\
&\geq K_1 [v]_{L^1([t_0+\tau, t_0+2\tau]\times D_*)} - K_2 \|v^-\|_{L^\infty([t_0,t_0+4\tau]\times [U\setminus\overline{D}])} \\
&\geq \frac{K_1}{\mu} \|v^-(t_0,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(U\setminus\overline{D})} - K_2 \|v^-(t_0,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(U\setminus\overline{D})} = \Big(\frac{K_1}{\mu} - K_2\Big)\sigma_0 =: \sigma_1. \qquad (2.48)
\end{aligned}$$

We fix $x_0 \in D_*$ such that $B_{2\rho}(x_0) \subset D_*$, which is possible by assumption. Since $\sigma_1 \geq q\sigma_0$ by (2.45), the estimates (2.48) and (2.46) allow us to apply Proposition 2.14 with $t_0 + 4\tau$ in place of t_0, which yields

$$v(t,x) \geq \sigma_1 e^{-\gamma(t-t_0-4\tau)} \Psi(x - x_0) \qquad \text{for every } x \in B_\rho(x_0),\ t \in [t_0 + 4\tau, T_0]. \qquad (2.49)$$

With the help of Theorem 2.9, (2.46) and (2.49), we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
v(T_0, x_*) &\geq K_1 [v]_{L^1([T_0-3\tau, T_0-2\tau]\times D_*)} - K_2 \|v^-\|_{L^\infty([T_0-4\tau, T_0]\times U_*)} \\
&\geq K_1 \sigma_1 e^{-\gamma(T_0-6\tau-t_0)} \frac{|B_\rho(0)|}{|D_*|} [\Psi]_{L^1(B_\rho(0))} - K_2 \sigma_0 e^{-(\gamma+1)(T_0-4\tau-t_0)} \\
&\geq \sigma_0 e^{-\gamma(T_0-4\tau-t_0)} \Big[\frac{K_1 |B_\rho(0)|}{(2R)^N} \Big(\frac{K_1}{\mu} - K_2\Big) [\Psi]_{L^1(B_\rho(0))} - K_2\Big] > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by our choice of μ in (2.45), contradicting (2.47). We conclude that $T_0 = \infty$. In particular, (i) holds, and (ii) follows since, by (2.46),

$$\|v^-(t)\|_{L^\infty(U)} = \|v^-(t)\|_{L^\infty(U\setminus\overline{D})} \leq \sigma_0 e^{-(\gamma+1)(t-t_0)} \qquad \text{for all } t \in [t_0, \infty). \qquad (2.50)$$

□

3 Proof of the main symmetry results

In this section we complete the proof of Theorems 1.1. With the tools developed in Section 2, we may follow the main lines of the moving plane method as developed by Poláčik in [26], but we note that some steps in the argument – in particular the proofs of Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 3.5 below – differ significantly from [26]. This is due to the fact that, contrary to [26], we do not a priori assume the existence of an element $\varphi \in \omega(u)$ with $\varphi > 0$. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we use the notations

$$\Omega_\lambda = \{x \in \Omega \,:\, x_1 > \lambda\}, \quad H_\lambda := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \,:\, x_1 > \lambda\}, \quad T_\lambda = \partial H_\lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_\lambda = T_\lambda \cap \Omega.$$

Moreover, we let $Q_\lambda : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^N$ denote the reflection at T_λ given by $Q_\lambda(x) = (2\lambda - x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N)$. For a function $z : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, we put

$$z^\lambda = z \circ Q_\lambda \,:\, \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$$

and

$$V_\lambda z : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad V_\lambda z(x) = z^\lambda(x) - z(x).$$

We now assume that the hypotheses (D_1) and $(F_1), (F_2)$ are satisfied, and we let u be a nonnegative global solution of (P) satisfying (U_1) and (U_2). We set

$$l := \max\{x_1 \, : \, (x_1, x') \in \Omega \quad \text{for some } x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}\},$$

and we fix $\lambda \in [0,l)$ for the moment. As discussed in Remark 2.2, the function $v := V_\lambda u$ is an entire antisymmetric supersolution of the problem

$$\partial_t v + (-\Delta)^s v = c_\lambda(t,x) v \tag{3.1}$$

in $(0,\infty) \times \Omega_\lambda$ with

$$c_\lambda(x,t) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{f(t,x,u^\lambda(x)) - f(t,x,u(x))}{u^\lambda(x) - u(x)}, & u^\lambda(t,x) \neq u(t,x); \\ 0, & u^\lambda(t,x) = u(t,x). \end{cases}$$

Here the term entire antisymmetric supersolution refers to the notion defined in the beginning of Section 2 with respect to the half space $H = H_\lambda$. Indeed, for $\lambda \in [0,l)$ and this choice of H, (2.4) and (2.5) are satisfied as a consequence of assumptions $(D1)$ and $(F2)$. Moreover, as a consequence of $(F1)$ and $(U1)$, there exists $c_\infty > 0$ such that

$$\|c_\lambda\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty)\times\Omega_\lambda)} \leq c_\infty \qquad \text{for every } \lambda \in [0,l).$$

In the following, we fix c_∞ with this property. We also note that $[V_\lambda u](t) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $t \in (0,\infty)$. For $\lambda \in [0,l)$, we now consider the following statement:

$$(S_\lambda) \qquad \|(V_\lambda u)^-(t)\|_{L^\infty(H_\lambda)} \to 0 \text{ as } t \to \infty.$$

Our aim is to show, via the method of moving planes, that (S_λ) holds for every $\lambda \in [0,l)$. We need the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *There is $\delta > 0$ such that for each $\lambda \in [0,l)$ the following statement holds. If K is a closed subset of Ω_λ with $|\Omega_\lambda \setminus K| < \delta$ and there is $t_0 \geq 0$ such that $V_\lambda u(t) \geq 0$ on K for all $t \geq t_0$, then*

$$\|(V_\lambda u)^-(t)\|_{L^\infty(H_\lambda)} \leq e^{-(t-t_0)} \|(V_\lambda u)^-(t_0)\|_{L^\infty(H_\lambda)}, \tag{3.2}$$

for all $t \geq t_0$. In particular (S_λ) holds if $\lambda < l$ is sufficiently close to l.

Proof. This follows immediately by applying Proposition 2.4 to $\gamma = 1$, $c_\infty > 0$ as fixed above, $H = H_\lambda$ and $U = \Omega_\lambda \setminus K$. Note that the number $\delta > 0$ given by Proposition 2.4 in this case does not depend on λ and K. The second statement of the lemma follows since $|\Omega_\lambda| < \delta$ if λ is close to l. ☐

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose $\lambda_0 \in [0,l)$ is such that (S_λ) holds for all $\lambda \in (\lambda_0, l)$. Then we have:*

(i) (S_{λ_0}) *holds.*

(ii) For each $z \in \omega(u)$ *we have either* $V_{\lambda_0} z > 0$ *on* Ω_λ *or* $V_{\lambda_0} z \equiv 0$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^N$.

(iii) If $\lambda_0 > 0$, *then for each* $z \in \omega(u)$ *we have either* $V_{\lambda_0} z > 0$ *on* Ω_λ *or* $z \equiv 0$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^N$.

Proof. (i) Since the set $\{u(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is relatively compact in $C(\overline{\Omega})$, the statement (S_λ) is equivalent to $V_\lambda z \geq 0$ on Γ_λ for all $z \in \omega(u)$. Hence (S_{λ_0}) holds by assumption and continuity of all $z \in \omega(u)$.

(ii) *Step one:* We first claim that on each connected component U of Ω_{λ_0} we either have $V_{\lambda_0} z > 0$ on U or $V_{\lambda_0} z \equiv 0$ on U. To prove this, we fix $z \in \omega(u)$ and a connected component U of Ω_{λ_0} such that $V_{\lambda_0} z \not\equiv 0$ on Ω_{λ_0}. Since $V_{\lambda_0} z \geq 0$, there exists $x_0 \in U$ and $\rho > 0$ such that $B := B_\rho(x_0) \subset\subset \Omega_{\lambda_0}$ and $V_{\lambda_0} z > 0$ on $\overline{B}$. Since $z \in \omega(u)$, there exists a sequence of numbers $t_n > 0$, such that $t_n \to \infty$ and $u(t_n) \to z$ in $C(\overline{\Omega})$, hence also $V_{\lambda_0} u(t_n) \to V_{\lambda_0} z$ in $C(\overline{\Omega_{\lambda_0}})$ as $n \to \infty$. Consequently, there exists $\sigma > 0$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$V_{\lambda_0} u(t_n, x) > 2\sigma \qquad \text{for } x \in \overline{B},\ n > n_0.$$

By the equicontinuity property $(U2)$, there exists $\tau > 0$ such that

$$V_{\lambda_0} u(t,x) > \sigma \qquad \text{for } x \in \overline{B},\ t \in [t_n - 4\tau, t_n],\ n > n_0. \tag{3.3}$$

Now fix a subdomain $D \subset\subset U$. Applying Proposition 2.9 with $U = \Omega_{\lambda_0}$, $t_0 = t_n - 4\tau$ and using (3.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{x \in D} V_{\lambda_0} u(t_n, x) &\geq K_1 [(V_{\lambda_0} u)^+]_{L^1([t_n - 4\tau, t_n - 3\tau] \times D)} - K_2 \sup_{t \in T} \|(V_{\lambda_0} u)^-(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(U)} \\ &\geq K_1 \sigma \frac{|B|}{|D|} - K_2 \|v^-(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(T \times U)} \qquad \text{for } n > n_0\end{aligned}$$

with suitable constants $K_1, K_2 > 0$ independent of n. Since (S_{λ_0}) holds, we conclude that

$$\inf_{x \in D} V_{\lambda_0} z = \lim_{n \to \infty} \inf_{x \in D} V_{\lambda_0} u(t_n, x) \geq K_1 \sigma \frac{|B|}{|D|} > 0.$$

Since $D \subset\subset U$ was chosen arbitrarily, we conclude that $V_{\lambda_0} z > 0$ in U. This shows the claim.

Step two: Let $z \in \omega(u)$ be such that

$$U_z := \{x \in \Omega_{\lambda_0} : [V_{\lambda_0} z](x) = 0\}$$

is nonempty. To finish the proof of (ii), we need to show that $V_{\lambda_0} z \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^N$. We suppose by contradiction that this is false; then there exists a compact set $\mathscr{K} \subset H_{\lambda_0} \setminus \overline{U_z}$ of positive measure such that

$$\inf_{\mathscr{K}} V_{\lambda_0} z > 0. \tag{3.4}$$

By Step one above, U_z is an open set. Hence we may fix a nonnegative function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(U_z)$, $\varphi \not\equiv 0$, and we set $D := \operatorname{supp} \varphi$. Moreover, we fix $\rho > 0$ with $\operatorname{dist}(D, \partial U) > 2\rho$, and we note that there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$\Big| \int_{B_\rho(x)} \frac{\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}\, dy \Big| < M \qquad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{3.5}$$

see e.g. [17, Lemma 3.5]). In the following, we put $v = V_{\lambda_0}u$ and $H = H_{\lambda_0}$. Moreover, we consider J and κ as defined in Lemma 2.3 for this choice of H. By Lemma 2.3 we have

$$\mathscr{E}(v(t),\varphi) = \frac{1}{2}\int\limits_H\int\limits_H (v(t,x)-v(t,y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))J(x,y)\ dxdy + 2\int\limits_H v(t,x)\kappa_H(x)\varphi(x)\ dx, \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$\int\limits_H v(t,x)\kappa_H(x)\varphi(x)\ dx \le \kappa_s\|\varphi\|_{L^1(U_z)}\|v(t)\|_{L^\infty(U_z)} \qquad \text{with} \quad \kappa_s := \frac{4^s\Gamma(\frac{1}{2}+s)}{\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma(1-s)}(2\rho)^{-2s}.$$

To estimate the double integral on the right hand side of (3.6), we put

$\mathscr{H}_1 := \{(x,y) \in H\times H : |x-y| \le \delta\}$, $\mathscr{H}_2 := H\times H\setminus\mathscr{H}_1$ and $\quad D_\rho := \{x\in\mathbb{R}^N : \operatorname{dist}(x,D) \le \rho\}$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int\limits_{\mathscr{H}_1}(v(t,x)-v(t,y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))J(x,y)dxdy = \int\limits_{\substack{|x-y|\le\delta,\\ x,y\in D_\rho}} (v(t,x)-v(t,y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))J(x,y)dxdy\\
&\quad = c_{N,s}\left(2\int\limits_{D_\rho} v(t,x)\int\limits_{B_\rho(x)}\frac{\varphi(x)-\varphi(y)}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}\ dydx\ -\int\limits_{\substack{|x-y|\le\delta,\\ x,y\in D_\rho}}\frac{(v(t,x)-v(t,y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))}{|x-Q_{\lambda_0}(y)|^{N+2s}}\ dxdy\right)\\
&\quad \le 2c_{N,s}M\,|D_\rho|\ \|v(t)\|_{L^\infty(U_z)} + \frac{4|D_\rho|^2}{(2\rho)^{N+2s}}\ \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(U_z)}\ \|v(t)\|_{L^\infty(U_z)},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $|x-Q_{\lambda_0}(y)| \ge 2\rho$ for every $x,y\in D_\rho$. To estimate the integral over $\mathscr{H}_2$, we first note that

$$\sup_{x\in H}\int\limits_{H\setminus B_\rho(x)} J(x,y)\ dydx \le c_{N,s}\int\limits_{R^N\setminus B_\rho(0)} |y|^{-N-2s}dy = \frac{N\omega_N c_{N,s}}{2s}\rho^{-2s} =: J_{N,s}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int\limits_{\mathscr{H}_2}(v(t,x)-v(t,y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))J(x,y)\ dxdy = 2\int\limits_D \varphi(x)\int\limits_{H\setminus B_\rho(x)}(v(t,x)-v(t,y))J(x,y)\ dydx\\
&\quad = 2\int\limits_D \varphi(x)\left\{v(t,x)\int\limits_{H\setminus B_\rho(x)} J(x,y)\,dydx - \int\limits_{H\setminus[B_\rho(x)\cup\mathscr{K}]} v(t,y)J(x,y)\,dydx - \int\limits_{\mathscr{K}} v(t,y)J(x,y)\ dydx\right\}\\
&\quad \le 2J_{N,s}\|\varphi\|_{L^1(U_z)}\Big(\|v(t)\|_{L^\infty(U_z)} + \|v^-(t)\|_{L^\infty(H)}\Big) - dm(t)
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have set

$$m(t) := \inf_{y\in\mathscr{K}} v(y,t) \qquad \text{and} \qquad d := \int\limits_D \varphi(x)\int\limits_{\mathscr{K}} J(x,y)\ dydx > 0.$$

We now consider the function $t \mapsto h(t) = \int_{U_z} v(t,x)\varphi(x)\,dx$ for $t > 0$. Combining the estimates above and using (3.1), we get

$$h'(t) = \int_{\Omega_{\lambda_0}} \partial_t v(t,x)\varphi(x)\,dx \geq \int_D c_{\lambda_0}(t,x)v(t,x)\varphi(x)\;dx - \mathscr{E}(v(t),\varphi) \tag{3.7}$$
$$\geq -c_\infty \|\varphi\|_{L^1(U_z)}\|v(t)\|_{L^\infty(U_z)} - \mathscr{E}(v(t),\varphi) \geq -C_1\|v(t)\|_{L^\infty(U_z)} - C_2\|v^-(t)\|_{L^\infty(H)} + m(t)d$$

with

$$C_1 := \|\varphi\|_{L^1(U_z)}\big[2\kappa_s + c_{N,s}M\,|D_\rho| + J_{N,s}\big] + \frac{2|D_\rho|^2}{(2\rho)^{N+2s}}\,\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(U_z)} \quad \text{and} \quad C_2 := J_{N,s}\|\varphi\|_{L^1(U_z)}.$$

We now consider a sequence $(t_k)_k \subset (0,\infty)$ such that $t_k \to \infty$ and $u(t_k) \to z$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ as $k \to \infty$, which yields in particular that $h(t_k) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Using (3.4) and the equicontinuity property $(U2)$, we find $\delta > 0$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$m_* := \inf\{m(t) \,:\, t \in [t_k - \delta, t_k + \delta],\, k \geq k_0\} > 0.$$

Moreover, making $\delta > 0$ smaller and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ larger if necessary, we may assume that

$$\|v(t)\|_{L^\infty(U_z)} \leq \|v(t) - v(t_k)\|_{L^\infty(U_z)} + \|v(t_k)\|_{L^\infty(U_z)} \leq \frac{m_*\,d}{4C_1} \qquad \text{for } t \in [t_k - \delta, t_k + \delta],\, k \geq k_0. \tag{3.8}$$

Moreover, using that $\|v^-(t)\|_{L^\infty(H)} \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$ as a consequence of (S_{λ_0}), we may again make $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ larger such that

$$\|v^-(t)\|_{L^\infty(H)} \leq \frac{m_*\,d}{4C_2} \qquad \text{for } t \in [t_k - \delta, t_k + \delta],\, k \geq k_0. \tag{3.9}$$

Combining (3.7), (3.8) and (3.9), we thus obtain

$$h'(t) \geq \frac{m_*\,d}{2} \qquad \text{for } t \in [t_k - \delta, t_k + \delta],\, k \geq k_0.$$

This implies that

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} h(t_k - \delta) \leq \lim_{k\to\infty}\Big(h(t_k) - \frac{\delta m_*\,d}{2}\Big) = -\frac{\delta m_*\,d}{2},$$

contradicting the fact that $\|v^-(t)\|_{L^\infty(U_z)} \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$ and thus $\liminf_{t\to\infty} h(t) \geq 0$. The proof of (ii) is finished.

(iii) Suppose that $\lambda_0 > 0$, and let $z \in \omega(u)$ such that $V_{\lambda_0} z \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^N$. In view of (ii), we need to show that $z \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^N$. For this we consider the reflected functions

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{u} : (0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}, && \tilde{u}(t,x) = u(t, Q_0(x)) \\ &\tilde{z} : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}, && \tilde{z}(x) = z(Q_0(x)). \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Since Ω and the nonlinearity f are symmetric in the x_1-variable, $\tilde{u}$ is also a solution of (P) satisfying the same hypotheses as u. Moreover, $\tilde{z} \in \omega(\tilde{u})$. Putting $\lambda_* := l - 2\lambda_0 \in (-l, l)$, it follows from $V_{\lambda_0} z \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^N$ that $\tilde{z} \equiv 0$ on Ω_{λ_*} and therefore

$$V_\lambda \tilde{z} \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_\lambda \qquad \text{for every } \lambda \in (\frac{\lambda_* + l}{2}, l). \tag{3.11}$$

For $\lambda \in (\frac{\lambda_*+l}{2}, l)$ sufficiently close to l, it also follows from Lemma 3.1 that (S_λ) holds for $\tilde{u}$ in place of u, so that (3.11) and (ii) imply that

$$V_\lambda \tilde{z} \equiv 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^N \text{ for } \lambda < l \text{ sufficiently close to } l. \tag{3.12}$$

¿From this we easily conclude that $\tilde{z} \equiv 0$ and therefore $z \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^N$, as claimed. ☐

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose $\lambda_0 \in (0,l)$ is such that (S_λ) holds for all $\lambda \in (\lambda_0, l)$. Suppose furthermore that one of the following conditions hold:*

(i) $z \not\equiv 0$ on Ω for all $z \in \omega(u)$.

(ii) Ω fulfills $(D2)$ and $V_{\lambda_0} z > 0$ on Ω_{λ_0} for some $z \in \omega(u)$.

Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $(S)_\lambda$ holds for each $\lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \varepsilon, \lambda_0]$.

For the proof of this lemma, the following observation is useful.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $M \subset C(\overline{\Omega})$ be a bounded and equicontinuous subset, and let*

$$I_\lambda(M) := \inf_{u \in M, x \in \Omega_\lambda} V_\lambda u(x) \qquad \text{for } \lambda \in [0,l).$$

Then the map $\lambda \mapsto I_\lambda(M)$ is left continuous, i.e., for $\lambda_0 \in (0,l)$ we have $I_\lambda(M) \to I_{\lambda_0}(M)$ as $\lambda \to \lambda_0, \lambda < \lambda_0$.

Proof. Since $\Omega_{\lambda_0} \subset \Omega_\lambda$ for $\lambda < \lambda_0$ and $V_\lambda z \to V_{\lambda_0} z$ uniformly on Ω_{λ_0} for every $z \in M$, we have $\liminf\limits_{\lambda \to \lambda_0^-} I_\lambda(M) \le I_{\lambda_0}(M)$. Now suppose by contradiction that there exists sequences of numbers $\lambda_n \in (0, \lambda_0)$, of functions $u_n \in M$ and of points $x^n \in \Omega_{\lambda_n}$ such that

$$\lambda_n \to \lambda \quad \text{and} \quad V_{\lambda_n} u_n(x^n) \to c < I_{\lambda_0}(M) \qquad \text{for } n \to \infty.$$

By compactness and equicontinuity, we may assume that there exists $\overline{x} \in \overline{\Omega_{\lambda_0}}$ and $u \in \overline{M} \subset C(\overline{\Omega})$ such that

$$x^n \to \overline{x} \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_n - u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \to 0 \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty,$$

where $\overline{M}$ denotes the closure of M with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$. Consequently,

$$Q_{\lambda_n}(x^n) = (2\lambda_n - x_1^n, x_2^n, \dots, x_N^n) \to (2\lambda_0 - \overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2, \dots, \overline{x}_N) = Q_{\lambda_0}(\overline{x})$$

and therefore

$$u_n(x^n) \to u(\overline{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad u_n(Q_{\lambda_n}(x^n)) \to u(Q_{\lambda_0}(\overline{x})) \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

Hence

$$V_{\lambda_0}u(\overline{x}) = \lim_{n\to\infty} V_{\lambda_n}u_n(x_n) = c < I_{\lambda_0}(M)$$

On the other hand, since $u \in \overline{M}$ and $\overline{x} \in \overline{\Omega_{\lambda_0}}$, it is easy to see from the definition of $I_{\lambda_0}(M)$ that $V_{\lambda_0}u(\overline{x}) \geq I_{\lambda_0}$. Hence we arrived at a contradiction, and thus the proof is finished. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Case one: We first assume in addition that $z \not\equiv 0$ on Ω for all $z \in \omega(u)$. By Lemma 3.2 this implies that $V_{\lambda_0}z > 0$ in Ω_{λ_0} for all $z \in \omega(u)$. Let $\delta > 0$ be such that the conclusion of Lemma 3.1 holds, and let $K \subset \Omega_{\lambda_0}$ be a compact subset and $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \lambda_0)$ be chosen such that

$$|\Omega_\lambda \setminus K| < \delta \qquad \text{for } \lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \varepsilon_1, \lambda_0]. \tag{3.13}$$

Since $V_{\lambda_0}z > 0$ in Ω_{λ_0} for all $z \in \omega(u)$ and $\omega(u)$ is a compact subset of $C(\overline{\Omega})$, we may choose $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$ such that

$$\inf_{z\in\omega(u), x\in K} V_\lambda z(x) > 0 \qquad \text{for all } \lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \varepsilon, \lambda_0]. \tag{3.14}$$

Let $\lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \varepsilon, \lambda_0]$, then (3.14) implies that there exists $t_0 = t_0(\lambda)$ such that

$$V_\lambda u(t,x) \geq 0 \qquad \text{for } x \in K,\, t \geq t_0.$$

Hence $\|(V_\lambda u)^-(t)\|_{L^\infty(H_\lambda)} \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$ by Lemma 3.1. Thus (S_λ) holds for $\lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \varepsilon, \lambda_0]$, as claimed.

Case two: We assume that $(D2)$ holds, and that $V_{\lambda_0}z > 0$ on Ω_{λ_0} for some $z \in \omega(u)$. By $(D2)$, the set Ω_{λ_0} has only finitely many connected components, and hence $\rho := \text{inrad}(\Omega_{\lambda_0})/4 > 0$. Let $\gamma = \gamma(N, s, \rho, c_\infty) > 0$, $q = q(N, s, \rho, c_\infty) > 0$ be as in Proposition 2.11, and let $\delta > 0$ be such that the conclusions of Proposition 2.4 hold with $\gamma + 1$ in place of γ.

Choose $D \subset\subset \Omega_{\lambda_0}$ such that D interesects each connected component of Ω_{λ_0} and

$$|\Omega_{\lambda_0} \setminus \overline{D}| < \frac{\delta}{2}, \qquad \text{inrad}(D) > 2\rho. \tag{3.15}$$

Fix $z \in \omega(u)$ such that $V_{\lambda_0}z > 0$ in Ω_{λ_0}, and let $t_n \to \infty$ be a sequence with $h(t_n) \to z$. Using the equicontinuity as in the proof of Lemma 3.2 we can find $r_1 > 0$, $\tau \in (0, \frac{1}{8})$ and n_0 such that

$$V_{\lambda_0}u(t,x) > 2r_1, \text{ for all } x \in \overline{D},\, t \in [t_n - 8\tau, t_n],\, n > n_0. \tag{3.16}$$

Let $r_0 := \frac{1}{4}\text{dist}(\overline{D}, \partial\Omega_{\lambda_0})$, $R = \text{diam}(D)$ and choose μ as in Theorem 2.15 for these parameter values. We first fix $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that

$$|\Omega_\lambda \setminus \Omega_{\lambda_0}| < \frac{\delta}{2}, \text{ for } \lambda \in [\lambda_0 - \varepsilon_1, \lambda_0). \tag{3.17}$$

¿From the equicontinuity assumption (U2) we may deduce that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sup_{[t_n-8\tau,t_n]\times D} |V_\lambda u - V_{\lambda_0}u| \to 0 \text{ as } \lambda \to \lambda_0. \tag{3.18}$$

This and (3.16) imply the existence of $\varepsilon_2 \in (0,\varepsilon_1)$ such that

$$V_\lambda u(t) > r_1, \text{ for all } x \in \overline{D}, t \in [t_n - 8\tau, t_n], n > n_0, \lambda \in [\lambda_0 - \varepsilon_2, \lambda_0]. \tag{3.19}$$

By (S_{λ_0}), we can find $n_1 > n_0$ such that for all $n > n_1$ we have

$$\|(V_{\lambda_0} u)^-(t_n - 8\tau)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{\lambda_0}\setminus\overline{D})} \le \frac{\mu r_1}{2}.$$

Using the equicontinuity of the functions $x \mapsto u(t_n - 8\tau, x)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and Lemma 3.4, we may choose $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_2)$ such that

$$\|(V_\lambda u)^-(t_n - 8\tau)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\lambda\setminus\overline{D})} \le \mu r_1 \qquad \text{for } \lambda \in [\lambda_0 - \varepsilon, \lambda_0]. \tag{3.20}$$

We now fix $n \ge n_1$ and $\lambda \in [\lambda_0 - \varepsilon, \lambda_0]$, and we claim that the assumptions of Theorem 2.15 are satisfied with $t_0 = t_n - 8\tau$, $U = \Omega_\lambda$, D as above and $v = V_\lambda u$. Indeed, $\text{dist}(\overline{D}, \partial U) \ge \text{dist}(\overline{D}, \partial\Omega_{\lambda_0}) \ge 4r_0$ and $|\Omega_\lambda \setminus D| < \delta$ by (3.15) and (3.17). Moreover, $\text{inrad}(D) > 2\rho$ and $\text{diam} D \le R$ by our choice of D and the definition of R. Moreover, by (3.19), $V_\lambda u$ is nonnegative on $[t_n - 8\tau, t_n] \times \overline{D}$, and by (3.19) and (3.20) we have

$$\|(V_\lambda u)^-(t_n - 8\tau)\|_{L^\infty(U\setminus\overline{D})} \le \mu r_1 \le \mu [V_\lambda u]_{L^1([t_n-7\tau, t_n-6\tau]\times D_*)}.$$

for each connected component D_* of D. An application of Theorem 2.15(ii) with these parameters therefore yields that (S_λ) holds for all $\lambda \in [\lambda_0 - \varepsilon, \lambda_0]$. The proof is finished. □

The following Proposition evidently completes the *Proof of Theorem 1.1.*

Proposition 3.5. *Suppose that $(D2)$ holds or that $z \not\equiv 0$ on Ω for all $z \in \omega(u)$. Then we have:*

(i) $V_0 z \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^N$ for every $z \in \omega(u)$.

(ii) For every $z \in \omega(u)$, we either have the following alternative. Either $z \equiv 0$ on Ω, or z is strictly decreasing in $|x_1|$ and therefore strictly positive in Ω.

Proof. (i) We define

$$\lambda_0 := \inf\{\mu > 0 : (S_\lambda) \text{ holds for all } \lambda > \mu\},$$

and we first claim that $\lambda_0 = 0$. By Lemma 3.1 we have $\lambda_0 < l$. If $z \not\equiv 0$ on Ω for all $z \in \omega(u)$, then Lemma 3.3 immediately implies that $\lambda_0 = 0$. If $(D2)$ holds and we assume – on the contrary – $\lambda_0 > 0$, then Lemma 3.2(iii) and Lemma 3.3(ii) readily imply that $z \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^N$ for every $z \in \omega(u)$, which then also yields $\lambda_0 = 0$. Hence we conclude in both cases that $\lambda_0 = 0$, and therefore $(S_0)_0$ is true by Lemma 3.2(i). This implies that $V_0 z \ge 0$ on Ω_0 for every $z \in \omega(u)$. Since the analogous statement can also be shown for the reflected solution $\tilde{u}$ defined in (3.10), we also have that $V_0 z \le 0$ on Ω_0 for every $z \in \omega(u)$. Hence for every $z \in \omega(u)$ we have $V_0 z \equiv 0$ on Ω_0 and thus also on $\mathbb{R}^N$, since $z \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$.
(iii) Let $z \in \omega(u)$ be given such that z is not strictly decreasing in $|x_1|$. Then there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that $V_\lambda z$ is not strictly positive in Ω_λ. By Lemma 3.2(ii), applied to λ in place of λ_0, we then have that $V_\lambda z \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^N$. By (ii), z therefore has two different parallel symmetry hyperplanes. This implies that $z \equiv 0$, since z vanishes outside a bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$. □

4 Appendix

As announced in the introduction, we first derive – based on recent regularity results in [19] and [30] – a sufficient criterion for condition $(U2)$. For a similar result in the context of local parabolic boundary value problems, see [26, Prop. 2.7].

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded domain, and suppose that the nonlinearity f satisfies $(F1)$ and $(F2)$. Suppose furthermore that $0 \in \mathscr{B}$, and that $f(\cdot,\cdot,0)$ is bounded on $(0,\infty)\times\Omega$. Then for any solution u of (P) satisfying $(U1)$ we have:*

(i) For any domain $G \subset\subset \Omega$ there exist $\alpha,\beta > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\substack{\tau\geq 1\\ t,\tilde t\in[\tau,\tau+1],t\neq\tilde t\\ x,\tilde x\in\overline{G},x\neq\tilde x}} \frac{|u(t,x)-u(\tilde t,\tilde x)|}{\big(|x-\tilde x|+|t-\tilde t|^{1/2s}\big)^{\alpha}} \leq \beta. \tag{4.1}$$

(ii) If, in addition, Ω fulfills the exterior sphere condition and, for some $t_0 > 0$, $C_1 > 0$,

$$|u(t_0,x)| \leq C_1 \operatorname{dist}(x,\partial\Omega)^s \qquad \textit{for all } x\in\Omega, \tag{4.2}$$

then

$$\sup_{t\geq t_0,x\in\Omega} \frac{|u(t,x)|}{\operatorname{dist}(x,\partial\Omega)^s} < \infty \tag{4.3}$$

In particular, $(U2)$ holds in this case.

Proof. (i) This follows immediately from [19, Theorem 1.2], since u satisfies, in weak sense,

$$\partial_t u(t,x) + (-\Delta)^s u(t,x) = f(t,x,u) - f(t,x,0) + f(t,x,0) \geq c(t,x)u + f(t,x,0)$$

with

$$c(t,x) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{f(t,x,u(t,x)) - f(t,x,0)}{u(t,x)}, & u(t,x)\neq 0;\\ 0, & u(t,x) = 0. \end{cases}$$

(ii) We use barrier functions as constructed in the elliptic setting in [30]. Put $B_r := B_r(0)$ for $r > 0$, and recall the definition of the space $\mathscr{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ in (2.1). By [30, Lemma 2.6] there exists a function $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^N)\cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s\varphi \geq 1 \quad \text{in } B_4\setminus B_1, & 0\leq \varphi(x)\leq c_0(|x|-1)^s \quad \text{for } x\in B_4\setminus B_1;\\ \varphi\equiv 0 \quad \text{in } B_1, & \varphi\geq 1 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N\setminus B_4 \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

as well as

$$\varphi(x) \geq d_0 \operatorname{dist}(x,\partial B_1)^s \qquad \text{for } x\in B_4\setminus B_1 \tag{4.5}$$

with some constants $c_0, d_0 > 0$. In fact, it is not stated explicitly in [30] that $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^N)\cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and that (4.5) holds, but this follows from the construction in [30, Appendix]. Now since Ω satisfies the exterior sphere condition, there exists $\rho > 0$ such that every point in $\partial\Omega$

can be touched from outside by a ball of radius ρ. Fixing such a ball $B_\rho(y)$ for some $y \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$, we may define the function

$$\psi \in H^s_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N), \qquad \psi(x) = \lambda\varphi(\frac{x-y}{\rho}).$$

Here, using (4.2) – (4.4) and the assumption that u satisfies $(U1)$, we may choose $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently large so that

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s\psi \geq \sup\limits_{t\geq t_0, x\in\Omega} f(t,x,u(t,x)) & \text{in } B_{4\rho}(y)\setminus B_\rho(y), \\ \psi \geq \sup\limits_{t\geq t_0, x\in\Omega} u(t,x) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{4\rho}(y) \\ \psi(x) \geq u(t_0,x) & \text{for } x \in \Omega\cap B_{4\rho}(y). \end{cases} \tag{4.6}$$

Let $w(t,x) = \psi(x) - u(t,x)$. By the properties (4.6), w is an entire supersolution of $\partial_t w + (-\Delta)^s w = 0$ in $[t_0,\infty)\times[\Omega\cap B_{4\rho}(y)]$ in the sense of Definition 2.1, and $w(t_0)$ is nonnegative on $\mathbb{R}^N$. Hence, by the weak maximum principle as stated in Remark 2.6, $w(t,x) \geq 0$ for $x \in \Omega$, $t \geq t_0$ and therefore

$$u(t,x) \leq \psi(x) \leq \frac{\lambda c_0}{\rho^s}(|x-y|-\rho)^s \qquad \text{for } x \in \Omega\cap B_{4\rho}(y),\ t \geq t_0.$$

Since the parameter λ in the definition of φ can be chosen uniformly with respect to the ρ-balls touching Ω from outside, we find – using also the boundedness of u on $[t_0,\infty)\times\Omega$ – a constant $C' > 0$ such that

$$u(t,x) \leq C'\text{dist}(x,\partial\Omega)^s \qquad \text{for } x \in \Omega,\ t \geq t_0. \tag{4.7}$$

Repeating the same argument with $-u$ in place of u, we find a constant $C'' > 0$ such that

$$u(t,x) \geq -C''\text{dist}(x,\partial\Omega)^s \qquad \text{for } x \in \Omega,\ t \geq t_0. \tag{4.8}$$

Combining (4.7) and (4.8), we obtain (4.3), as claimed. Now $(U2)$ follows easily by combining (4.1) and (4.3). ☐

Remark 4.2. We finally discuss a specific subclass of nonlinearities in equation (P) which gives rise to global bounded solutions as required in Theorem 1.1. For this we assume that Ω is a bounded domain satisfying the exterior sphere condition. Moreover, we consider an Allen-Cahn-type nonlinearity

$$f : [0,\infty)\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}, \qquad f(t,x.u) = a(t)u - b(t)u^3 = u[a(t)-b(t)u^2] \tag{4.9}$$

Here $a,b : [0,\infty)\to\mathbb{R}$ are continuous functions with $a(t) \leq b(t)$ for $t \geq 0$. Then f satisfies $(F1)$ with $\mathscr{B} = \mathbb{R}$, and it trivially satisfies $(F2)$ if Ω satisfies $(D1)$. Moreover, the constant 1 is a supersolution of problem (P), whereas 0 is a solution. Hence, if $\varphi \in C_0(\Omega)\cap\mathscr{H}^s_0(\Omega)$ is such that $0 \leq \varphi(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in \Omega$, standard methods in semigroup theory and the weak maximum principle (see Remark 2.6) give rise to the existence of a unique global solution of the initial value problem

$$\begin{cases} u \in C([0,\infty),\mathscr{H}_0^s(\Omega)\cap C_0(\Omega))\cap C^1((0,\infty),L^2(\Omega)), \quad (-\Delta)^s u \in C((0,\infty),L^2(\Omega)) \\ \partial_t u(t) + (-\Delta)^s u(t) = f(t,x,u(t)) \qquad \text{for } t\in(0,\infty), \\ u(0) = \varphi. \end{cases} \tag{4.10}$$

satisfying $0 \le u(t,x) \le 1$ for all $t \in (0,\infty)$, $x \in \Omega$, so that condition $(U1)$ is satisfied for u. Furthermore, if $\varphi(x) \le C\text{dist}(x,\partial\Omega)^s$ for $x \in \Omega$ with some constant $C > 0$, then $(U2)$ is also satisfied by Proposition 4.1(ii). We remark that the solution u can be found as a the unique mild solution of (4.10), i.e., the unique solution of the nonlinear integral equation

$$u \in C([0,\infty),C_0(\Omega)), \qquad u(t) = S_A(t)\varphi + \int_0^t S_A(t-\tau)F(\tau,u(\tau))\,d\tau \quad \text{for } t\in[0,\infty). \tag{4.11}$$

Here S_A denotes the semigroup generated by the m-dissipative operator

$$A : \text{dom}(A) \subset C_0(\Omega) \to C_0(\Omega), \qquad Au := -(-\Delta)^s u$$

where $\text{dom}(A) := \{u \in \mathscr{H}_0^s(\Omega)\cap C_0(\Omega) \ : \ (-\Delta)^s u \in C_0(\Omega)\}$. Moreover, $F : [0,\infty)\times C_0(\Omega) \to C_0(\Omega)$ is the substitution operator given by $[F(t,w)](x) = f(t,x,w(x))$ for $t \in [0,\infty)$, $x \in \Omega$. The m-dissipativity of the operator A in $C_0(\Omega)$ is essentially a consequence of the following recent regularity result given in [30, Proposition 1.1]: If $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded domain satisfying the exterior sphere condition and $w \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, then the unique weak solution $u \in H_0^s(\Omega)$ of the equation $-\Delta u = w$ belongs to $C_0(\Omega)$. Another important fact needed for the local existence and uniqueness of solutions of (P) is the local uniform (in time) Lipschitz continuity of $F : [0,\infty)\times C_0(\Omega) \to C_0(\Omega)$, which follows since f satisfies $(F2)$. In order to show solutions of (4.11) are also solutions of (4.10), one may essentially argue as in [13] for the semilinear heat equation, noting the following additional useful property of the substitution operator F: If $M \subset C_0(\Omega)\cap\mathscr{H}_0^s(\Omega)$ is bounded with respect to $\|\cdot\|_\infty$, then $F(M) \subset \mathscr{H}_0^s(\Omega)$, and there exists $L = L(M) > 0$ such that

$$\mathscr{E}(F(t,u),F(t,u)) \le L\mathscr{E}(u,u) \qquad \text{for all } u \in M,\, t > 0. \tag{4.12}$$

This property can be checked immediately by using $(F2)$ and the definition of the quadratic form $\mathscr{E}$.

Note that (4.9) is just a particular example of a nonlinearity which admits an ordered pair of a bounded subsolution φ_* and a bounded supersolution φ^* and which satisfies $(F1)$ with $\mathscr{B} = \mathbb{R}$. In such a setting, an initial condition $\varphi \in C_0(\Omega)\cap\mathscr{H}_0^s(\Omega)$ always gives rise to a global bounded solutions of (P).

References

[1] A. D. Alexandrov, *A characteristic property of the spheres*. Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata. Series IV, 58 (1962), 303-315.

[2] D. Applebaum, *Lévy Processes and Stochastic Calculus*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009.

[3] M. Birkner, J. A. López-Mimbela, and A. Wakolbinger, *Comparison results and steady states for the Fujita equation with fractional Laplacian*, Annales de L'Institut Henri Poincaré **22** (2005), 83–97.

[4] K. Bogdan, T. Kulczycki, and M. Kwaśnicki, *Estimates and structure of α-harmonic functions*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **140** (2008), 345–381.

[5] C. Brändle, E. Colorado and A. de Pablo, *concave-convex elliptic problem involving the fractional Laplacian*, to appear in Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh. Section A. Mathematics

[6] E. Chasseigne, M. Chaves and J. D. Rossi, *Asymptotic behavior for nonlocal diffusion equations*, Journal de Mathématiques Purés et Appliquées. **86** (2006) 271–291.

[7] L. Caffarelli, C. H. Chan and A. Vasseur, *Regularity theory for parabolic nonlinear integral operators*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society **3** (2011), 849–869.

[8] X. Cabré and Y. Sire, *Nonlinear equations for fractional Laplacians I: Regularity, maximum principles, and Hamiltonian estimates*, available online at http://arxiv.org/abs/1012.0867.

[9] L. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre, *An Extension Problem Related to the Fractional Laplacian*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations **32** (2007), 1245–1260.

[10] X. Cabré and J. Tan, *Positive solutions of nonlinear problems involving the square root of the Laplacian*, Advances in Mathematics **224** (2010), 2052–2093.

[11] L. Caffarelli and A. Vasseur, *Drift diffusion equations with fractional diffusion and the quasi-geostrophic equation*, Annals of Mathematics. Second Series **171** (2010), 1903–1930.

[12] A. Capella, J. Dávila, L. Dupaigne, and Y. Sire, *Regularity of radial extremal solutions for some non local seminlinear equations*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **8** (2011), 1353–1384.

[13] T. Cazenave and A. Haraux, *An Introduction to Semilinear Evolution Equations*, Oxford Science Publications, Oxford, 1998.

[14] S.-Y. A. Chang and M. del Mar González, *Fractional Laplacian in conformal geometry*, Advances in Mathematics **226** (2011), 1410–1432.

[15] H. A. Chang Lara and G. Dávila, *Regularity for solutions of non local parabolic equations*, available online at http://arxiv.org/abs/1109.3247.

[16] W. Chen, C. Li and B. Ou: *Classification of solutions for an integral equation*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics **59** (2006), 330–343.

[17] E. di Nezza, G. Palatucci, and E. Valdinoci, *Hitchhiker's Guide to the Fractional Sobolev Spaces*, Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques **136** (2012), 521–573.

[18] P. Felmer, A. Quaas and J. Tan, *Positive solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equation with the fractional Laplacian*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh. Section A. Mathematics **142.2** (2012), 1237–1262

[19] M. Felsinger and M. Kassmann, *Local regularity for parabolic nonlocal operators*, available online at http://arxiv.org/abs/1203.2126.

[20] B. Gidas, W. N. Ni and L. Nirenberg, *Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **68.3** (1979), 209-243.

[21] N. Jacob, *Pseudo Differential Operators and Markov Processes, Vol. I, II, III*, Imperial College Press, London, 2005.

[22] T. Jin and J. Xiong, *A fractional Yamabe flow and some applications*, available online at http://arxiv.org/abs/1110.5664.

[23] M. Kassmann, *A new formulation of Harnack's inequality for nonlocal operators*, Comptes Rendus Mathématique. Académie des Sciences. Paris **1.349** (2011), 637–640.

[24] R. Servadei and E. Valdinoci, *Variational methods for non-local operators of elliptic type*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems **33.5** (2013), 2105–2137.

[25] P. Poláčik, *Symmetry properties of positive solutions of parabolic equations on $\mathbb{R}^N$: I. Asymptotic symmetry for the Cauchy problem*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations **30** (2005), 1567–1593.

[26] P. Poláčik, *Estimates of Solutions and Asymptotic Symmetry for Parabolic Equations on Bounded Domains*, Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis **183** (2007), 59–91.

[27] P. Poláčik, *Symmetry Properties of Positive Solutions of Parabolic Equations: A Survey*, World Scientific 2009 (2009), 170–208.

[28] P. Poláčik and S. Terracini *Nonnegative solutions with a nontrivial nodal set for elliptic equations on smooth symmetric domains*, to appear in Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society.

[29] A. de Pablo, F. Quirós, A. Rodríguez and J. L. Vázquez, *A fractional porous medium equation*, Advances in Mathematics **226** (2011), 1378–1409.

[30] X. Ros-Oton and J. Serra, *The Dirichlet Problem for the fractional Laplacian: Regularity up to the boundary, submitted*, available online at http://arxiv.org/abs/1207.5985.

[31] J. Serrin, *A symmetry problem in potential theory*, Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis **43** (1971), 304-318

[32] M. E. Schonbek and T. P. Schonbek, *Asymptotic Behavior to Dissipative Quasi-Geostrophic Flows*, SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis **35** (2003), 357–375.

[33] R. Song and Z. Vondraček, *Potential theory of subordinate killed Brownian motion in a domain*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **123** (2003), 578–592.

[34] J. Tan, *The Brezis-Nirenberg type problem involving the square root of the Laplacian*, Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations **42** (2011), 21-41.

[35] G. N. Watson, *A Treatise on the Theory of Bessel Functions*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1922.